IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:12CV790-HTW-LGI

THE CITY OF JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI, JXN WATER

DEFENDANT

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE HENRY T. WINGATE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

FEBRUARY 27, 2024 JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

(APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN.)

REPORTED BY: TERI B. NORTON, RMR, FCRR, RDR

Mississippi CSR #1906

501 EAST COURT STREET, SUITE 2.500 JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201 TERI_NORTON@MSSD.USCOURTS.GOV (601)608-4186

1	FOR THE PLAINTIFF, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	ANGELA GIVENS WILLIAMS, ESQUIRE MITZI DEASE PAIGE, ESQUIRE
3	U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 501 EAST COURT STREET, STE. 4.430
4	JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201
5	KARL J. FINGERHOOD, ESQUIRE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
6	ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT SECTION POST OFFICE BOX 7611
7	WASHINGTON, DC 20044
8	ANGELO MO, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ENRD
9	150 M STREET, N.E., ROOM 2.900 WASHINGTON, DC 20002
10	Madrineron, 20 20002
11	FOR THE PLAINTIFF, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI:
12	ROY FURRH, ESQUIRE DONNA J. HODGES, ESQUIRE
13	MS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY 515 EAST AMITE STREET
14	JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201
15	CHRISTIN B. WILLIAMS, ESQUIRE LATESHYA MARTIN, ESQUIRE
16	MS STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH POST OFFICE BOX 1700
17	JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39215-1700
18	
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT, CITY OF JACKSON:
20	TERRELL S. WILLIAMSON, ESQUIRE OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
21	455 EAST CAPITOL STREET JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201
22	orionolity risostobility 33201
23	FOR THE DEFENDANT, JXN WATER:
24	CHARLES MITCHELL MCGUFFEY, ESQUIRE FORMAN, WATKINS & KRUTZ, LLP
25	POST OFFICE BOX 22608 JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39225-2608

THE COURT: Call the case, please. 1 2 THE CLERK: Your Honor, this is United States of 3 America versus City of Jackson, Civil Action No. 4 3:12cv790-HTW-LGI, and related case, Civil Action No. 3:22cv686-HTW-LGI. We are here this morning for a status 5 6 conference. At this time, I'm going to ask that the parties 7 state their names for the record, starting with the plaintiff 8 in the courtroom. MR. FINGERHOOD: Good morning, Your Honor. 9 Fingerhood with the U.S. Department of Justice, Environmental 10 Protection. 11 12 **THE COURT:** Good morning to you. 13 MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Your Honor, Angela Williams with the U.S. Attorney's Office representing the 14 15 United States. 16 MS. PAIGE: Good morning, Your Honor. Mitzi Dease 17 Paige with the U.S. Attorney's Office as well. 18 MR. FURRH: Good morning. Roy Furrh with the 19 Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality. 20 MR. HODGES: Good morning, Your Honor. Donna Hodges 21 with the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality. MS. MARTIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Lateshya 22 23 Martin with the Mississippi State Department of Health. 24 MS. CHRISTIN WILLIAMS: Good morning, Your Honor. 25 Christin Williams with the Mississippi State Department of

MR. BLACK: Patrick Black and Azande Williams on

behalf of the Mississippi Department of Human Services.

24

25

THE COURT: Good morning. 1 2 MS. ARMOR: Good morning, Your Honor. Suzanne Armor, 3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta, Georgia. 4 **THE COURT:** Okay. Good morning. 5 MS. WETHERINGTON: Michelle Wetherington, also EPA in 6 Atlanta. 7 MR. CRESWELL: Michael Creswell, also EPA in Atlanta, 8 sir. 9 THE COURT: Good morning to both of you. MS. HERNANDEZ: Mikaila Hernandez (unintelligible). 10 11 THE COURT: My court reporter could not hear you. 12 Could you repeat it one more time? 13 MS. HERNANDEZ: Mikaila Hernandez for the putative intervenor plaintiffs, People's Advocacy Institute and 14 15 Mississippi Poor People's Campaign. 16 THE COURT: Thank you so much. That's due to our 17 poor equipment. It has nothing to do with you. 18 All right. Next? 19 MS. EARLY: Good morning, Your Honor. Emily Early, 20 also here on behalf of the proposed intervenor plaintiffs, 21 Mississippi Poor People's Campaign, and the People's Advocacy Institute. And we also have two of our client representatives 22 23 with us, Danielle Holmes of the Mississippi Poor People's 24 Campaign, and Brooke Floyd of the People's Advocacy Institute. 25 THE COURT: Next?

MS. HYMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. This is
Claudia Williams Hyman, also appearing with the proposed
plaintiff intervenors, Mississippi Poor People's Campaign, and
People's Advocacy Institute.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anybody else?

All right, then. Welcome all of you. There are a number of matters that I want to address here, and I will leave some time and opportunity for people to bring up a new subject, and I will make the determination whether we ought to delve into anything beyond what I had planned for us to do, but we will address each one and see where we are going on all of these things.

Ms. Early? Ms. Early?

MS. EARLY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Can you hear me?

MS. EARLY: Yes, I can.

THE COURT: My doctors tell me I don't drink enough water. I saw you bring a great big jug to your lips a couple of seconds ago.

MS. EARLY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And then after that, you brought another jug to your lips in a different container. Is that all of that water or is it something else?

MS. EARLY: No, one is coffee, and the other is water.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. You are mixing your 1 2 coffee and water? 3 MS. EARLY: I think it is pretty much all the same. 4 One just gives me more pep in my step. 5 **THE COURT:** Oh, that's what it is. I just finished 6 telling my courtroom deputy, Terri, just about 15 minutes ago, 7 when she brought me some coffee, I'm not a coffee drinker, but 8 she brought me some anyway, because we've been doing some work 9 on this thing and she wanted to make sure that I had, as you just put it, pep in my step, and so she then brought me this 10 11 coffee. And I think she is trying to get me started on coffee, 12 but it's not working, Terri. But anyway --13 MS. EARLY: You have to drink a lot of it. THE COURT: That's what it is? I couldn't help but 14 notice that you had this jug that you started off with, and 15 16 then you went to some other kind of container. So the first 17 one was water? Is that it? MS. EARLY: Yes. We all need it. 18 19 THE COURT: And the second one was coffee, you are 20 telling me. Is that it? 21 MS. EARLY: Yes, sir. Yes. **THE COURT:** And you say it works? 22 23 MS. EARLY: It does, yeah, at least psychologically 24 it does. I tell myself it does and I need it to function.

THE COURT: Maybe I need to try that, then, because

25

when I wake up at 2 and 3:00 in the morning, I just can't go 1 2 back to sleep, and so maybe I need to try it. 3 MS. EARLY: Try it and let us know how it works. 4 **THE COURT:** I'm going to do that. Is it any kind of special coffee? Does it have a sign on it? 5 6 MS. EARLY: No, just plain coffee. 7 THE COURT: Just plain coffee. Guaranteed to keep me 8 up. Is that it? 9 MS. EARLY: Yes, sir. THE COURT: I will be working on that, then. Because 10 11 I woke up this morning at 2:00. So I thought I would try some 12 coffee, so I told Terri about it. So she went and fixed me 13 some coffee this morning. But I'm not a coffee drinker, so it doesn't do me any good. I'm not sleepy, though. But I'm not a 14 15 coffee drinker. But I had to comment on it because I saw you 16 taking two containers. That's all. MS. EARLY: I promise, it's just coffee. 17 THE COURT: Okay. I'm just meddling. That's all. 18 19 MS. EARLY: Understood. 20 THE COURT: All right. Let's start. Representatives 21 of the ACLU, are you out there? MS. RANEY-GRAY: Yes, Your Honor. 22 23 **THE COURT:** Please stand. Now, who are you?

MS. RANEY-GRAY: I'm McKenna Raney-Gray with the ACLU of Mississippi.

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. How long have you been with the 1 2 ACLU? 3 MS. RANEY-GRAY: Two and a half years. 4 THE COURT: Welcome. 5 MS. RANEY-GRAY: Thank you. 6 **THE COURT:** I see someone else standing. 7 MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor. I'm Ayanna Hill with the ACLU. 8 9 **THE COURT:** Okay, then. Good morning to you too, then. 10 11 MS. HILL: Good morning. 12 **THE COURT:** Okay, then. Did I miss anybody who wants 13 the record to show you are present? Terri, is there someone else? 14 THE CLERK: No, sir, that's all I'm aware of. 15 16 THE COURT: Thank you very much. As I said, this is 17 a status conference, and there are a number of items that I 18 would like to have addressed. Mr. Henifin is going to lead the 19 discussions on these various matters. I will leave some time 20 for questions and also some time for other topics that might 21 concern us after Mr. Henifin has gone down the list of those matters that he and I have discussed that we would like to have 22 23 some airways on. So Mr. Henifin, are you ready to go? 24 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: How, Mr. Henifin, go to the podium,

please. How are you today?

MR. HENIFIN: I'm well. How are you this morning? Either with or without coffee.

THE COURT: Yeah, but you know what that answer is.

Mr. Henifin, of course, knows that I've been sick, and I have had COVID. Nobody jump up and run, please. My doctors tell me I'm no longer contagious, and I have moved away from contagion for the last four weeks or five weeks. I am now in that element of post contagion where now I'm just trying to get well from how the disease has sort of affected my body, but I'm told I am not -- I'm not active anymore, but I'm in that post stage where my doctors are telling me that it's going to take some time for my body to heal itself.

That is very disconcerting to me, as it would be to you, but it is especially disconcerting because at the time that COVID struck me for the second time, and the worst time, I was in the midst of training for some athletic events, and those of you who are out there that have been around me, you know how I'm always doing contests. So the half marathon was coming up, and in addition, the triathlon was coming up. That's where you swim a half mile and then ride your bike for about 30 miles, and then after that, you run or walk for five or seven miles and then add up all your times to see how well you did.

I was ahead of my training schedule for that, as well as ahead of my schedule for my bike, because this is during that

time period where I should be getting ready for my hundred-mile bicycle ride. So I was quite delighted that I was ahead of my training for all of those, and then COVID had other ideas. So I had to go to the emergency room twice and had to visit with my cardiologist three times because of the effects of COVID on me.

And so I am now in the post COVID stage, but I can't do anything athletic. In fact, for me to walk from here to my office is a strain, as Mr. Henifin, you saw me suffering.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So I can barely walk, but it's going to be okay, though. So that's what I anticipate, that maybe another two weeks of this stuff, because I've been down now for about six weeks, I think. But anyway, as soon as I get to where I should be, then I will go back to my training, I hope.

In the meantime, this matter is set, and I can handle this because for me to sit up here does not bother me as I would be bothered if I had to actually walk somewhere. So now that I'm seated, I'm okay. But when I get ready to leave out of here, it's not going to be okay.

Now, Mr. Henifin, we met earlier --

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- and talked about the subjects that need to be discussed at this status conference, and I had asked that you give us a list of those so that everybody here would

understand which ones are on the list to be discussed. 1 2 could you, then, very slowly read off that list, Mr. Henifin? 3 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 4 **THE COURT:** So that everybody here knows the order in 5 which we will take these subjects and what those subjects would 6 be. 7 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. So the first item 8 will be an update on the last quarterly report and the status 9 of the water and sewer systems, which I will provide. 10 **THE COURT:** Okay. 11 MR. HENIFIN: The second item is related to the EPA 12 grant funding and some discussion around how that process is 13 moving forward. **THE COURT:** The grant funding, that is, how the 14 15 mechanism you receive your moneys --16 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 17 **THE COURT:** -- to try to satisfy your indebtedness to 18 all of the project managers on the various ones that are being 19 operated. 20 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 21 **THE COURT:** Next? MR. HENIFIN: The next item is on the SNAP data. 22 23 we have created a rate classification, customer classification 24 based on their receiving SNAP benefits. We have had some 25 struggles getting the data we need to make the categorical --

the customers automatically put into that category if they are receiving those benefits. We will discuss where we are on that.

THE COURT: That's very important for us to discuss. First of all, we want to provide some remedy to those who have some difficulty in paying for water services, and we also want to be sure that the public understands exactly where that dilemma is at the present time, because this whole matter of this SNAP data and approach was revealed some time ago, almost a month ago, if not longer, when we looked at how we could address that matter for those people who are financially without.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And we want to be sure that we've looked at every opportunity to provide them some relief. And we don't want people to think that we have forgotten them because we have not moved on that to the final completion. So we want to be sure they know exactly where we are and why we are somewhat stalled on that matter.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Correct?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Next matter.

MR. HENIFIN: And then there's the lawsuit from Lakeland Seniors. It's a senior facility here in Jackson.

1 They are asking your permission to -- or you are granting them 2 leave to sue myself, JXN Water, over some flooding that 3 occurred before we were even in existence. 4 **THE COURT:** Okay. And they have to get permission 5 from this Court --6 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir. 7 **THE COURT:** -- to wage a lawsuit against you and 8 others connected with this court matter. And I will hear them 9 as to what they wish to say on that particular point before we adjourn. Now, is there another subject? 10 11 MR. HENIFIN: I believe the rest would be open for 12 future updates and any other items you want to take up, Your 13 Honor. THE COURT: Okay. So that's what we plan on 14 15 discussing. On this last matter, the one involving this 16 lawsuit, which is asking for permission to proceed, you have 17 with you your counsel; is that correct? MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 18 19 **THE COURT:** Now, introduce your lawyers again. 20 course, I know who they are, but let's make sure that the 21 record is clear that they are here. So introduce them again. MR. HENIFIN: We have Mitch McGuffey, Paul Calamita, 22 23 and they will be discussing the Lakeland -- we have developed the motion on Lakeland. They will be discussing that in 24 25 I will also ask them to discuss the SNAP issue when we detail.

1 get to that. 2 **THE COURT:** So your counsel have filed a motion in 3 regard to the lawsuit. MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: And what is the title of your lawsuit, 5 the motion? 6 7 MR. MCGUFFEY: Your Honor, just for clarification, 8 Lakeland Seniors is the one -- is actually the movant. 9 have filed a motion for leave to file suit against JXN Water. We have filed responses in opposition for a bevy of reasons 10 11 that I'm happy to go over now or when we get to that issue. 12 THE COURT: No, no, just wait. I will get to you 13 later. That will work. But the motion itself 14 MR. MCGUFFEY: is filed in the consolidated docket, I believe it is Document 15 16 Number 50. It is a motion for leave to sue JXN Water. 17 **THE COURT:** Okay. You heard the list of topics to be discussed, and so I put that down near the end of the four 18 19 topics that we are going to discuss right off with Mr. Henifin 20 and with you. But you will have the opportunity to make a presentation on this matter concerning the lawsuit. 21 MR. MCGUFFEY: Your Honor, before we get to that, 22 23 counsel for Lakeland Seniors has not appeared today. Do you

THE COURT: Would you do so, please?

want me to reach out to them?

24

25

MR. MCGUFFEY: I would be happy to.

THE COURT: And I was going to ask you that same question because I didn't see them here either, and I wanted them here to hear you on this matter.

MR. MCGUFFEY: Yes, Your Honor.

wanted us to cover. And perhaps some people in the audience representing other organizations would have some additional topics they would like to inquire about, and so then I intend to take those two. So we are all set up to go through all of these matters. And after each one of these topics, then I will open the floor for discussion on that particular topic so that we can keep the apples and apples together as opposed to combining the apples and the oranges and so that we can know exactly where we are on each one of these topics.

Now, Mr. Henifin, are you prepared to go forward now?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Henifin, of course, everybody here knows who you are. And could you then introduce yourself and give just a brief background on how we come to this spot with you? Again, all of us know that, but nevertheless, if someone from outside this circle picks up this transcript, then I want them to fully understand who you are and how you got to be where you are.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. I'm Ted Henifin, the

interim third-party manager. I was named that in the interim stipulated order signed on November 29, 2022, in the water case. And in October of this year, October 5th, I believe the actual order was signed for the sewer case. In both cases I'm the interim third-party manager to basically manage and operate and get the water system stable as well as sustainable moving forward. There's a list of projects in both of those that I'm to initiate and get moving, and -- we lost video or maybe lost --

THE COURT: Are you saying we lost some connection?

THE CLERK: We lost our video connection.

THE COURT: Go ahead and get us back together.

THE CLERK: They are back.

MR. HENIFIN: They are back.

(Off-Record)

MR. HENIFIN: So that's what got us here was the four parties that negotiated the interim stipulated order. The City of Jackson, Mississippi State Department of Health, the EPA, and the Department of Justice came together and negotiated an order and produced it and presented it to you for signing, which you did, and in that order, the four parties agreed to name me as the interim third-party manager. I'm still not exactly sure how I got to that point, but I've taken the job and trying to do my best to improve the water and sewer system here in Jackson.

THE COURT: All right. Now, then, Mr. Henifin, let's take up topic number one.

MR. HENIFIN: Sure. It's great -- it's happy when you can come in front of the Court and talk about some real positives that have happened over the course of the last year.

We now have the water system operating. To our knowledge, no one has seen it operate this way in over 20 years. We have one member of our staff who has been working in the Jackson Water System for 20 years. No one can recall when the system actually operated the way it was designed.

The water systems are designed to treat water from your water source and pump it into a series of pipes, push it out through your community. You have a number of elevated storage tanks throughout the system that during periods of low use, typically in the middle of the night, water flows into the tanks, and then during the times of the day when people are using water, it comes out of the tanks, but it is set at an elevation to create pressure in the system, and you do that throughout the system. So in an ideal world, you are pumping water at a pretty constant rate out of your treatment plants. It serves folks' needs, and as it needs additional water, the tanks provide that water and pressure throughout the city.

Prior to this, we were trying to create all the pressure from our two treatment plants, the O.B. Curtis plant up near the reservoir and the J.H. Fewell plant down here at waterworks

curve. We had to push as much water and a high pressure into the system at that point to try to get it to go through the whole system. A combination of the valves we have opened, the pipes we have fixed, have allowed the system to start behaving the way the water system was designed to behave.

As a result, we have been able to take plants offline for periods of time to do required maintenance, which we have never been able to do before without impacting the rest of our customer base. We have been able to reduce the pressure coming out of the plants, which will help us from breaking pipes as we move forward.

We have also seen the demand drop down to somewhere between 40 and 42 million gallons a day. This summer we were above 58 million gallons a day, largely due to leakage or loss of water throughout the system. So we are gaining on the reduction in losses. We are gaining because we are not having to put it out as a high pressure, and the lower pressure we can put water out, the less is going to squeeze out in some of these unfound leaks.

We are still highly committed to finding the rest of the leaks. We are still losing a tremendous amount of water. We have got much better data today than we have had in the past through our meters. About 98 percent of our new meters are installed. They are AMI meters, meaning they send a signal every hour to let us know how much water has gone through the

meter on an hourly basis. We can see things that we have never been able to see, like property that might have a leak on it.

During the freeze, we identified some high-use meters that we were seeing a lot of water go through them on vacant property. One in particular that has been our poster child for this has been the former putt-putt and golfing facility on North State Street.

THE COURT: Tell us about that. You have already briefed me on that. But we are talking about a facility on North State Street that was an amusement park, putt-putt, and it's been there for years and years and years. In fact, it might have been there when I was in high school, which means that it is really a relic.

Now, that facility at one time was highly used, but then over the course of time, it has gone into disrepair and has not been utilized like it was at one point.

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: Now, then, it is a facility that covers a number of acres, and I believe there's a -- isn't there a driving range out there too?

MR. HENIFIN: There was a driving range in the back. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. It was a driving range, a golf driving range out there. And then there's the putt-putt, and it was out there, but that facility currently is closed.

MR. HENIFIN: It looks very abandoned. I've only got
history in Jackson since the fall of '22, and I know it's
looked abandoned since the time I've been here driving past it.
I can't tell you when it became abandoned, but I can tell you
it is very abandoned.
THE COURT: But I think it has been abandoned for
quite awhile.
Now, then, that facility, nevertheless, at one time
consumed a lot of water, but it was not consuming it has not
been consuming water lately.
MR. HENIFIN: It should not have been.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, you investigated that because
you investigated that facility and its consumption of water, or
what might have been a consumption, along with other leaks at
facilities that did not, should not have been registering as
utilizing water.
So, question, how large is that facility?
MR. HENIFIN: So the amount of water that was being
consumed at that point in time when we were looking for
large-using meters was about 600,000 gallons a day.
THE COURT: 600,000 gallons per day?
MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Now, give me another comparison so I know
what 600,000 gallons a day would amount to.
MP HENTETN. Volument my math skills right now?

THE COURT: No, I'm just saying how many residences 1 2 would that have covered? 3 MR. HENIFIN: A normal residence would use about 300 4 gallons a day. So 600,000, that's 2,000 residences --5 **THE COURT:** About 2,000. And we are talking about 6 treated water? 7 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** That means it's been to the plants. 8 9 water that's been drawn off the reservoir and treated, and then it was sent to the homes? 10 11 MR. HENIFIN: Correct. 12 **THE COURT:** So in this particular case, the water was 13 sent out to this facility, but it was just sitting there, 14 correct? MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. There shouldn't have 15 16 been any use at the facility at that point in time. 17 **THE COURT:** And did you find that the water had 18 actually been utilized by anybody? 19 MR. HENIFIN: The abandoned property looked a lot 20 more like a wetland when we approached it in January. 21 Hopefully it has dried up since we turned the water off, but yes, there was a huge area that basically was just flooded on 22 23 the property. And this is treated water that was 24 THE COURT: 25 sitting there in a flood-like situation?

1 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Now, so you went out there with your crew 3 to investigate. 4 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 5 **THE COURT:** Now, pick it up from there. What did you find? 6 7 MR. HENIFIN: So we found there was definitely water 8 We searched for the meter, found where the meter was installed and had the meter shut off and removed, since there 9 was no longer anybody using the water. So we were able to stop 10 11 that flow entirely. But again, that's a reduction of 600,000 12 per day that we were putting through the system just to be 13 dumped out on an abandoned piece of property. **THE COURT:** Okay. So that matter has been rectified? 14 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 15 16 THE COURT: In order for that water to be 17 reactivated, that is, continued to flow, what would have to be done? 18 19 MR. HENIFIN: The property owner would have to repair 20 the leaks so that when we turn the meter back on, you would not 21 see flow, basically pressure test the system before we can turn the meter back on. 22 23 The nice thing about our meters right now, again, we get 24 hourly reads from all of them, so we can see exactly when they 25 are leaking. And if the water consumption never goes to zero

during a day, it typically indicates that there is leaking water somewhere on the property, whether it is a drip in a faucet or a running toilet that the owner might not know about, or in this case, a large discharge into an abandoned property.

We had a church that had a broken line in the woods behind their property that was part of their service. We continue to find these through better data.

The meter project, for the record, I was against at this time last year. I was trying to find ways not to install meters. They have proven to be very valuable data tools for us to see leaks in the system, identify places we need to look harder. So we are actually going to add some data analysis contractors to help us look at this data in a closer manner to make sure we are picking up every place that might have excess water usage. And in the case of existing residential commercial customers, be able to reach out to them and let them know that we are seeing excessive use through their meter, and they might want to look at investigating their own property for leaks to avoid those high bills that would be associated with those leaks.

THE COURT: Now, I'm not sure that at the present time you have the statistic that I'm about to ask you about. At one time when -- well, back when we first started, we looked at the amount of treated water that was earmarked for the homes in Jackson and how much of that treated water was actually

arriving at its intended destination. I seem to recall that at one time that you advised me that only about 54 percent or somewhere around in there was actually making it to the homes, and the rest of the treated water was a mystery because it was not reaching the intended homes or businesses, which meant that there were some leaks along the way that had to be discovered and addressed. Otherwise, the pipes were losing all of this treated water with the concomitant loss of person power, chemicals, time, not to mention trust in the system by the public.

Now, how close was I on the amount of water that was actually being delivered?

MR. HENIFIN: It was really about a third was getting to the meters. And when we were doing this last year and using some national averages and estimates based on the number of properties we served, we thought that it was somewhere around 15 million gallons a day should satisfy our customers.

We now have better data, again, through the meters. We know that it varies between 15 and 18 million gallons a day is what goes through the meters to our customers. We had been putting out in excess of 50 million gallons a day up until January, and then after the freeze, we fixed a few things, including the golf course waste of water and some others. We are down now to about 42 million gallons a day going out of the plants, 18 million gallons a day being consumed by our

customers, leaving that delta of 26 million gallons a day still, somewhere in the 16 million to 26 million gallons a day still being lost. So we have made progress, but we are nowhere near where we need to be.

THE COURT: Okay, then. So what you are telling me is that we are still losing some water through leaks?

MR. HENIFIN: At least 25 million gallons a day, maybe, somewhere in that range, down from 30 or 35. It's a positive. We are moving in the right direction.

earlier, a cost due to personnel involvement, which means their efforts to provide safe, clean water has come to naught with regard to that amount of water that is being lost and that amount of water which has not made it to its intended destination. Some of that water has simply proceeded back into the soil when it has been lost through the pipes. Is that correct?

MR. HENIFIN: I think the majority at this point, for what we are looking for, we have largely found I think most of the visible leaks that are breaching the surface, or a great number of those, but I believe what we are finding -- what we believe is happening today is that water is leaking out of breaks in water lines under streets and under dirt and moving its way to find its path of least resistance, which ends up into a broken sewer line, and then the water moves to our sewer

treatment plant, having never been used by anybody.

We now have data on the characterization of the sewage going into the treatment plant at Savanna Street, which is our main wastewater treatment plant, and it's about one-third of the concentration you would expect for regular sewage, meaning it is highly diluted.

We also don't see a change in flow during the day that you would expect. People use their water when they wake up in the morning. A lot of water goes into the sewer with morning showers, getting ready for work, getting ready for school. It flattens out during the day a significant amount, maybe a little bump at lunchtime, and then when everyone gets home, fixing dinner, washing clothes, doing the things they do, we see a second peak. So they call that a diurnal pattern that you see in sewage. It's an interesting thing to watch how the sewage use goes during the day.

We don't see the diurnal pattern at our sewer treatment plant, the Savanna Street plant, meaning there's some source of consistent water filling those sewage pipes. We are confident that's where the majority of the 20-million-plus that we are losing is somehow getting into the sewer maybe in multiple locations throughout the city.

We are now turning our investigation into how do we find where that is getting in and how do we correct it so we fix the water lines and the sewer lines so that the water is not

1	flowing out of the water lines and into the sewer lines. So
2	that is a re-prioritization for where we are looking for leaks.
3	We expected it somewhat, but we just received the data in the
4	last couple of months to really highlight the fact that what's
5	getting to the sewage treatment plant is highly diluted and it
6	doesn't have this pattern you would expect to see with just
7	sewage where you can see this diurnal pattern during the day.
8	THE COURT: And please tell us how this affects water
9	pressure across the city.
10	MR. HENIFIN: All of those leaks make it harder to
11	maintain pressure. So as we continue to find and fix those
12	leaks, the system pressure should
13	(Telephone interruption).
14	THE COURT: That was my doctor's office calling. He
15	wants me.
16	MR. HENIFIN: Don't miss your appointment, Your
17	Honor.
18	THE COURT: What I'm saying is, they want my body.
19	Go ahead.
20	MR. HENIFIN: So the combination of these things have
21	really changed our focus to finding where the drinking water is
22	getting into the sewer and ending up at the treatment plant.
23	At least now we have got a new target, and that's really
24	because we have received new data to help us understand that.
25	And we really do think we have maxed out on the visible leaks.

We still get leaks every day, breaks. We have got crews working on them. But the major leaks, like the golf course one that you visited, and we had another one down off of McDowell Road that was similar in size, and again, we had the 600,000 gallons a day at the golf course. So we are picking up the big ones, and we are continuing to work on the small ones as they occur, but we are really focused now on how is it getting from the water system to the sewer system.

But again, from a system pressure standpoint, the system is holding pressure very well because of the way the system is operating with the elevated tanks and the lower pressure is coming out of the plant. We have now opened almost 360 valves that were closed on the system, which, again, is why it is working better. And we have fixed 11 valves that were frozen totally and couldn't operate. We have had more than a thousand leaks repaired.

And the boil water notices continue to be issued on a small scale around these fixes. So those aren't going to go away anytime soon. There are a lot of people focused on boil water notices. They haven't been -- the last quarter there were no -- up until the last -- the whole last year, we didn't have any citywide boil water notices. We had the little bobble with the Mississippi Department of Health on an E. coli issue that caused a one-day, day-and-a-half citywide outage. That was in early January. You are aware of that issue. We talked

about that.

THE COURT: Why don't you say something else about that because we were dismayed about that boil water notice. So why don't you say something about that because --

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- that boil water notice doesn't appear to have been justified.

MR. HENIFIN: So the requirement for the water system is to test in this distribution system. There are 120 locations that we test. You draw a sample and you are looking for fecal bacteria in those samples, and we do that every month from those 120 locations, so we are constantly pulling samples. The only certified lab to do those samples in Central Mississippi is the state labs. We have a contract with the health department's laboratory. And we turn those samples in to the State, and they do the analysis and provide the results.

In this particular case, we turned in our samples for that particular day. We don't sample all 120 in the same day. It is throughout the month. It makes it easier on our staff to get their rounds done. They turn those samples in for analysis usually in the afternoon, and then we get results. It's an 18 or 24-hour test, depending on which method they are using. They will provide us the results.

This is done by water systems, community water systems across the United States. It's a very routine process. Rarely

do you get a positive test for fecal bacteria, and in this case it was E. coli. And we were notified of the positive test the day after we turned in the samples. We also learned that neighboring community, Flowood, had two positive tests as well at the same time. It seemed a little suspicious just because they are so rare to happen, to have two communities have two samples basically in the same analysis period to have positive E. coli results. It seemed suspect.

The EPA procedures, the rules allow a second confirmation sample to be taken the next day, both from the locations that tested positive and then upstream and downstream of those within your system. We took those samples as soon as we heard that the first set of samples had the positives. Those were tested the next day, and they turned out to be negative, which indicated that perhaps it was a false positive the first day, but without confirmation, EPA doesn't assess any penalty or any violation. Essentially, it should have just gone away after the confirmation.

Unfortunately, EPA has given primacy to the states for all of the drinking water enforcement requirements. States can be more stringent than the federal standards. They can't be less stringent. In this case, Mississippi has taken an extremely conservative approach in the past where the minute they get the positive E. coli first sample, unconfirmed, they issue a boil water notice. So that's what they did in this case. They

lifted it after we got the confirmation samples back, but again, I have understood they have made some emergency changes to their process to align with the EPA standards onboard, and I think that ultimately will be put into their regulations for the process.

So at the end of the day, I think we are going to be in alignment with EPA for future issues like this where we would get opportunity to provide confirmation samples before the boil water notices are issued citywide.

THE COURT: So that boil water notice did not indicate a backwards step? It did not indicate that there was some sort of oversight or failure on the part of JXN Water?

MR. HENIFIN: Correct. I mean, it's a problem that when you have the boil water notice because you have those positive E. coli samples, that is a failure. You have got some sort of bacteria entering the water system, and you've got to figure out why and how. But the confirmation sample said it isn't in the water system, so we had no further action at that point.

THE COURT: Right. So the confirmation system didn't confirm?

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: The confirmation system that ordinarily, if there was a problem, would have said that, yes, you have some E. coli in your system?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: But when this matter was retested, even the very next day, that confirmation system did not confirm that we had E. coli in our system?

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: Now -- and that testing procedure, that protocol, is there for just that reason, to determine if a water system actually is experiencing a problem or whether this is sort of a haphazard result that could be the result of just some error on the test part.

MR. HENIFIN: The sample could have gotten contaminated during the sampling process, the lab could have had an error during the analysis process, lots of places for error in that whole process. And it's amazing we -- when I'm using "we," it's water systems across the United States -- don't have more problems when you are looking at how challenging it is to get a very clean sample into a sterile bottle to a lab and get tested in a fairly short period of time. It is ripe for problems and errors, but the system works very well as it currently stands.

THE COURT: We were concerned about there being an error because, according to the report on this E. coli from two different water systems, they were essentially identical in their report, but nevertheless, the water would have emanated from two different water systems.

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: And that seemed to be strange that you would get almost identical findings from two different water systems but nevertheless have a report on the same E. coli. When they retested, they didn't find confirmation.

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: And then when we retested, we did not find any confirmation.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So then we were concerned as to the potential of error in a matter of that situation where it just didn't seem to pass the test of confirmation, and it just seemed as though there were two systems that were reporting the same findings on one day but not reporting it thereafter. But meanwhile, the boil water notice had gone out, which alerted the public. And unfortunately, some of the public thought, here we go again on boil water notices. When we did the confirmation tests, we saw there was nothing we needed to do because it looked like that whole matter was just an error of some type. Now, is that what we found?

MR. HENIFIN: And I know the health department, to their credit, lifted the order as soon as we got our confirmation sample. That's not what they normally would have done, so that's nice and in short order. I know they have done a complete review of that process. They didn't find error that

really happened. If an error happened in the lab, they weren't able to determine it at point in time.

So it still remains a mystery somewhat as to how we got the positive E. colis from Flowood and ours, but I think, again, the positive is that the procedures are changing to wait for a confirmation sample before they would issue a boil water notice.

THE COURT: And as I said, what alerted us initially to the possibility that this was simply a mistake is that we have virtually identical findings from two different systems, two different water systems. And then when both performed the test again, neither registered positive. And so that's what initially called our attention to this whole matter.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And thus even though that was the case, we still didn't just conclude that that must have been a mistake. We still went back into our system to check to see if there was something we should know about, and we found nothing.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that correct?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the other system also checked, and they found nothing.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So then the question was, where did it

come from? And the only thing we could conclude was that it was a giant mistake.

Now, anything else on this update?

MR. HENIFIN: So I was going to go quickly to the sewer side of the house.

THE COURT: Hold it. Don't move. Terri, come here. (Off-Record)

THE COURT: Now, to the sewage problem.

MR. HENIFIN: Just a quick update there that was in the quarterly report as well. We have priority projects listed there. Number two is the 215 locations that had dry weather overflows at the time we entered the order. We have resolved 44 of those completely and 45 were under construction at the beginning of January. We think by now we've got all of those done by now as well, so we are somewhere close to 100 complete out of the 215 in the first quarter, a little over the first quarter. So you recall when we are talking about this last July, we thought it might take three or four years to get to all of those, and we are making great progress. We feel real positive. We have the staff and contractors doing that work, and they are really doing a fabulous out there to resolve these longstanding issues within neighborhoods.

Priority project number 3 is cleaning and TV inspection contracts. We are required under the order to do a hundred miles per year. In this first quarter, we completed just under

25, so slightly under pace to get to the hundred, but we will pick it up. Again, we had to start things from scratch, so we expect to easily meet that hundred miles of cleaning and TV inspection done by the end of the year.

On priority project number 4, that was investigating the outstanding 2200 open service requests that we got from the city. We have done more than -- we have investigated more than 1300 and cleared those and closed those up to this point. So we are on pace to get the rest of those done this quarter and perhaps be done by the end of this current quarter and investigating those outstanding. And a lot of those just hadn't been looked at, and so when we get to them, we went out there and they had already been resolved but just hadn't gotten the paperwork cleaned up. So that work is in process.

We responded to 128 new sanitary sewer overflows during the quarter. Most of those we were able to resolve unless they were on the private property piece of the overflow. We have a lot of overflows that occur because of the sewer line that goes from the house to the main line, and most of those are in the right-of-way. So the current situation for Jackson is that we have got the property owner responsible for the sewer line from their house to the main sewer line.

One example has been a woman that lives on Raymond Road.

The main is toward the other side of the street from her. You would have to dig up two lanes of traffic on a big road to fix

her problem in her line. We think that is a real challenge going forward, and we are going to propose to the parties a process to where we might be able to change that in the coming weeks. So that proposal will come so that we can take some responsibility and make those repairs on that privately owned piece within that public right-of-way. That is coming, but that is where a lot of these SSOs continue to crop up and we can't resolve because it is on private property. It is technically the line on the property, but we have some solutions we are working on.

So we had one pump station sanitary sewer overflow during the quarter, and we resolved that at the time we found it.

There are 99 pump stations, so there's a lot of opportunity for some overflows there when the line leaving the pump station has a problem, but we took care of that one.

We had no West Bank Interceptor overflows during that first quarter, which is great. We have had a few since then this quarter, but we are working on, as another priority project, just to understand what repairs are needed to keep the West Bank Interceptor working and not overflowing.

And then we had prohibitive bypasses on Savanna Street.

And this is an ongoing problem. So a prohibitive bypass, more flow shows up at the treatment plant than can be put through the process. So then they divert that flow to some storage basins, and then when those basins are full, they have to

divert it to the Pearl River. That is something that we don't want to ever happen.

So we have got a couple of things moving to try to help address that, one of which is we are working with the Corps of Engineers to develop a project to dredge these storage basins, because they have lost a lot of capacity because they haven't been cleaned out in a long time. That will provide additional capacity to hold the wastewater until the rain event drops down and we can put it through our treatment process.

The other piece is, the treatment plant has some maintenance and operation issues that keep it from running at full capacity. We are working hard to identify how we can make those repairs so that the treatment plant can actually treat more flow than currently is pushed through it.

So there are a couple of things happening there that really weren't highlighted when we entered the order, and we knew we had problems with the sewage coming out in the streets, and that's job one. If anything goes in anyone's houses, job one, it's a big priority. But we have had some wet weather overflow issues which we knew we would have, and that's not something we are totally focused on, but these bypasses at the treatment plant are indicative of us really needing to make some investments in the Savanna Street treatment plant to eliminate that in the future. We are working on that.

Other than that, I think the bottom line is we are making

great process in the relatively short time we have been working. We are at a year in the water system and one quarter in the sewer system. And I think the team we have put together are both JXN Water staff and local contractors we are working with, and the appreciation and support we are getting from the citizens of Jackson has been overwhelming. They thank our contractors constantly. They don't get upset when we have to close roads and dig up yards. They are very appreciative of the work we are doing. And we are all going to get through this together, and we are making great progress towards that end. I think that's the positive we would like to leave for this last quarterly report.

THE COURT: Now, let's talk about the quantum of complaints. When we started this venture, there were numerous myriad complaints about what was transpiring and not transpiring. A call center was set up, and even that had some controversy because it was moved somewhere where it appeared that that would be a better place to address all of these calls that were coming in. We kept track of the response times that were being recorded for the critics of the system to be able to report and to understand how fast we were getting back to them.

So then with regard to those caller oral complaints, how has JXN Water fared?

MR. HENIFIN: We are still seeing a high volume of calls. In fact, as we get more focused on billing and

1 collection, the call volume goes up as meters have been 2 installed. We handled 30,000 calls last quarter, just approximately 30,000, and we did those --3 4 **THE COURT:** That is 30,000 over how many months? 5 MR. HENIFIN: Over three months. 6 THE COURT: Over three months. And how many people 7 are answering these calls? 8 MR. HENIFIN: So we've got four dedicated during the 9 time frame between 8 and 5 on weekdays, but then the call center itself has about 30 folks able to pick up other calls. 10 11 So our dedicated folks can do a pretty much deep dive and 12 resolve issues a little better than the rest of the staff. 13 The way it is set up is there are specialties within the call center. We are not their only client. They have got 14 15 multiple clients. So there are folks that sit in the call 16 center, and if they are available and our call folks are tied 17 up, then the call rolls to one of these other less specialized 18 people to answer the call and either resolve the issue or 19 elevate it to someone else who can resolve it. It hasn't been 20 perfect, but with those 30,000 calls, our average wait time is 21 just over two minutes, two minutes and one second. **THE COURT:** You made a comparison at one point as to 22 23 what the response time was prior to JXN Water setting up this

What was that response time?

MR. HENIFIN: The response time could be measured in

24

25

center.

hours in the previous -- towards the end of Jackson's running of their water system. Their staff had been pretty decimated at that point, just people leaving and not being replaced. So the wait times were excruciatingly long at that point in time.

THE COURT: And you said hours, didn't you?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So does that mean that people just stayed on the telephone line waiting to be heard?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. We have all done it.

You know, maybe you put it on speaker and go about your

business while you are waiting for someone to answer the phone.

Whether it is a water complaint, or a credit card question,

unfortunately that's not heard of. Trying to change an airline

reservation can take that long these days.

THE COURT: And so now what is the average response time?

MR. HENIFIN: So it's a little over two minutes to get an answer on the phone. And there are cases where folks have to wait longer. That's an average. There are some cases where they get picked up on the first call. And we still don't have a great work order tracking system yet, so we don't have a full tracking of every completed item that gets called in, but that should go into effect here in the next few months. We have been building a lot of systems that weren't existing when we got here, and we are making great progress there, but

there's still lots of work to be done.

THE COURT: I want to highlight one endeavor in particular which I think sort of sums up the lengths you have been going to try to resolve some of these complaints. Every now and then I have some telephone call which advises me of a complaint, and then I then pass it on to you. And after passing it on to you, then I monitor to see what transpired as a result of that report.

These complaints run the gamut. Some folk are complaining about wet soil under their homes that they think contain some contaminants. Some complain of the woodwork in the house, the flooring that they say has been contaminated and needs to be addressed. Some have gone so far as to say they think they need to move out of their particular house because it has been irretrievably damaged. And then there are those who think that they have contracted some disease from maybe some contaminated water, and they want to be examined by some doctor or medical professional to verify or to determine that they are wrong in what they think. I'm thinking about one in particular who called me, and they called because they thought they had some portion of everything I just stated, and then I passed it on to you.

MR. HENIFIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: As I have on some others. And I mentioned this because you handled this last one I just

mentioned, just like you handled all the others, and that you 1 2 and your staff went out and investigated. Now, without calling the name of our friend who had made 3 4 the complaints, who now, incidentally, is satisfied --5 MR. HENIFIN: That's good to hear. 6 THE COURT: -- that you had made some deep investigation on this matter, would you tell me what you 7 8 investigated? 9 MR. HENIFIN: Sure. In this case, we ended up sending Dr. King -- we have a contract with a local 10 11 environmental firm. Dr. King tested the air and water and soil 12 at the house and found --13 THE COURT: All right. Now, Dr. King, tell me about Dr. King's credentials. 14 MR. HENIFIN: Dr. King has been in the business of 15 16 environmental testing and analysis for over 20 years, has their own firm here in Jackson, highly qualified Ph.D., and 17 personally gets involved in these investigations, then again, 18 19 subcontractors that do some of the sampling and analysis, but 20 highly qualified right here local, a brilliant woman, great to have her as a resource, and she is under contract with us to do 21 some of these investigations. So she did a number of the 22

THE COURT: Well, hold it. Let's take one step at a time.

investigations. We had the ditch cleaned next --

23

24

25

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So this caller had a number of concerns?

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: First of all, she thought that her house, which sits on blocks and had an air space under it, had been contaminated by water that was disease-ridden. Secondly, she thought that this had impregnated the wood under her house.

Next, there's a ditch next to her house, and she thought that the ditch had overflowed on more than one occasion, which led to some problems. And then she thought that this overflow carried some contamination which had a deleterious effect on her health.

Now, these were all matters that sorely concerned her. She was highly disturbed because she said that she had been trying to call to report these matters before JXN Water came onto the scene for some two years, I believe, and that she had been left on the telephone with no one answering, and that she couldn't seem to get her complaint through. And even when someone finally came out, they gave her some answers that were problematical to her because they didn't address what her concerns were. And it was at that stage where she called me up and I then referred her to you.

Now, then, tell me what you did.

MR. HENIFIN: So other than bringing Dr. King in to do those investigations, I had the ditch cleaned out as well,

which we didn't find any problems with, but it could have used 1 2 a little maintenance, so we took care of that. And then, 3 finally, I tried to go under the house myself, but I'm a little 4 There wasn't a great access. It's a fairly low 5 house. But I took photos at various locations to understand 6 what was happening under the house. 7 THE COURT: Now, did you all snake some sort of equipment under the house? 8 9 MR. HENIFIN: I just stuck my hand and my camera in at various locations. 10 11 THE COURT: Okay. So then you and your folk looked 12 under the house --13 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** -- and then tested the soil? 14 15 MR. HENIFIN: We tested the soil. 16 THE COURT: So then when you tested the soil, you 17 were looking to see if the soil was contaminated. 18 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 19 **THE COURT:** What did you find? 20 MR. HENIFIN: It was not. We couldn't find any 21 contamination of any of the soil, any of the samples that were taken, whether they were air, soil, water. That covers what we 22 did. 23 24 **THE COURT:** Now, this air sample that you are talking 25 about, you tested the air in the house?

1 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: You also tested the wood that was under 3 the house? 4 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 5 **THE COURT:** And you tested various places in the 6 house to see if they were contaminated. 7 MR. HENIFIN: I'm not saying we are going to do this 8 every time someone has a complaint, but this one wouldn't go 9 away. I know, but this one was tested in the 10 THE COURT: 11 manner in which it was because our caller was -- it showed 12 where she had made complaints for over two years. 13 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: As well as the household across the 14 15 ditch, who had made complaints for over some two-year time 16 period and had not gotten a response. And so then my thought 17 and your thought was that someone who has been waiting this 18 length of time to get an answer needed to get a complete 19 answer. 20 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir, and she had moved out of her 21 house, Your Honor. She wasn't even living in it then. She was afraid to live in it. 22 23 THE COURT: That's right. She moved in with her 24 daughter because she was concerned about all of this. So then 25 you tested under the house, and you tested the ditch, even had

weeds and everything else cut down in the ditch.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that was infested with mosquitoes?

MR. HENIFIN: Not at the time we cleaned it, but I'm sure at some point it was.

THE COURT: Yeah. And then you made all of the tests, and then you had Dr. King involved to explain to her whether she actually had some sort of malady as a result of that. She has and had a malady, but it was not attributable to any contaminated water. She has a malady which I won't go into, but it has a number of causes beyond contamination, and she did not have any physician that said that she had a contamination that caused her ailment because of any kind of water. And so then Dr. King examined her. Is that correct?

MR. HENIFIN: Well, provided the information.

Because she's not a medical doctor. She provided her the information she knew about, the connection between the environmental issues, the environment she was in and the particular malady she had and was able to explain there wasn't a connection based on the results she had received.

THE COURT: And then since I had been involved at one time, then I wanted to get all the literature and read it and get what I could from her on this medical matter and study it to determine if any of that was involved in anything JXN Water was doing, because her complaints started well before JXN Water

1 had gotten involved in this. 2 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Now, in terms of time, how much time did 3 4 you spend on that matter? 5 MR. HENIFIN: We probably spent, over the course of 6 several months, maybe 40 man-hours, not including Dr. King's 7 contract. **THE COURT:** Okay. The aim was to determine if her 8 9 complaint had any substance to it and to be sure that she 10 understood where JXN Water was coming from on this matter. 11 Now, didn't you talk to her personally? 12 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 13 **THE COURT:** Didn't you also write her a letter? 14 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 15 **THE COURT:** So haven't there been other people who 16 have had some concerns, but nevertheless, once they have been 17 afforded the information that you have discovered, recognized 18 that their complaint was not viable concerning what they 19 thought they had? 20 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. We have a process set 21 up for discolored water, odor -- odoriferous water or anything like that. We will first check the street to make sure there's 22 23 not a systemwide problem. If we still find it, if we don't 24 find anything on the street, we report the house where the 25 complaint is, and if we need to at that point, we bring

Dr. King in to do water sampling and testing. It only happens maybe five times a month at this point. But we do encourage people if they are having discolored water, some challenge, to please call the call center and let us know the address and the time and we can investigate those.

We see some social media posts from time to time with people showing pictures of brown water in the bathtub, but if we don't have actual address and time, we really can't address that. And we do a lot of repairs. We have done a thousand repairs. That might cause the water to stir up and might get a little dirt in the lines at that point. Even though it gets super chlorinated, it has no health issues, it can cause discoloration. And we all know we still have hundreds of miles of small diameter pipe that can cause discoloration with any kind of disturbance in the flow in those neighborhoods that are served by that small diameter pipe.

So discolored water is still going to be an issue, but we've gotten systems in place to be able to respond and help folks understand what the issue is, how to actually drain their own -- flush their own house. Many times we find it is a water heater issue that started in the water heater in the house. So we have lots of -- we are getting lots of experience in dealing with discolored water issues. We just show folks that it's safe, what the cause may have been, and how to resolve it by flushing their own systems.

THE COURT: Now, this discolored water, when that discoloration is the product of pipes which fall under the jurisdiction of the homeowner, then they are not within the jurisdiction of JXN Water.

MR. HENIFIN: Correct. We will help advise them. Is it only discolored when you run your hot water? If they say yes, then we say likely a hot water issue. You might want to call a plumber. You can drain your hot water tank entirely and then refill it and see if that resolves the problem. We try to provide as much advice as we can around the issue and the information we get from the customer.

THE COURT: But if the pipe that is causing the problem falls within the shoulders -- falls upon the shoulders of the homeowner, then the homeowner has to make the repairs at the homeowner's expense?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I know it's kind of hard to state what's an average cost of repair for something like that. I know each one may have to be evaluated on its own merits, because you don't know how large the problem is, whether there is a main pipe to the house or smaller pipe, how long the problem has been going on. But when your people go out to inspect all of this, do they seek to give any kind of estimate as to how much this might cost?

MR. HENIFIN: No, Your Honor, we don't try to take a

guess at that, but we encourage them to call a local plumber to come out and deal with their issues.

THE COURT: And after you have made your investigation, and recommended that a local plumber be called in, do you explain to the homeowner why this is a matter for the homeowner?

MR. HENTFIN: Yes. Overwhelming majority understand that. Once we have walked them through that and show them we're not having an issue on the street, their neighbor is not having an issue, it is definitely in their house, they seem very accepting that we have done an explanation, we have done an investigation, and they thank us. And I'm guessing most of them call a plumber and figure it out.

THE COURT: Now, here's a question that we have not discussed recently. We discussed it some time ago, but we have not come to a conclusion yet as to what can be done, but are there moneys for which the homeowner can apply or might be able in the future to apply for to address matters like this?

MR. HENTFIN: There aren't any on the drinking water side. On the sanitary sewer side, that is where we find the biggest challenges, they own the line from their house to the sanitary sewer main, which is out in the street, and that section that is in the right-of-way is the area that we have some money for, as part of a supplemental environmental project that was part of the original consent decree. So we are still

1	working on some procedures on how to get that money in place
2	and let folks access those funds to fix that part of their
3	sewer service line that goes from their house all the way to
4	the street. There are a number of cases where those need some
5	work.
6	THE COURT: And do you have any idea how long it
7	might be before that system has worked out its kinks?
8	MR. HENIFIN: I'm hoping within the next three
9	months, we will have that process and proposal. We will
10	present it again to the parties and to the Court, and then I
11	will hopefully have a way to move forward from there.
12	THE COURT: So can I say then at our next report,
13	quarterly report
14	MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: I will hear more about how successful
16	that particular project is?
17	MR. HENIFIN: It might be the following quarterly
18	report because we are already two months into this quarter, and
19	I can't guarantee we will get it in place by March, but by
20	June, the quarter that ends June 30th, we will definitely
21	THE COURT: That will tell us the number of people
22	that have been able to take advantage of some moneys?
23	MR. HENIFIN: It will tell us how the process will
24	work from that point forward. We probably won't have many that
25	have been able to take advantage yet, but we will have it in

_	prace so that we can start advertising and promoting now that
2	project works.
3	THE COURT: Do you know how much money will be set
4	aside for that type of project?
5	MR. HENIFIN: There's \$600,000 and some change for
6	that that the City had put aside for the supplemental
7	environmental project. They had done some work under that.
8	That started with the consent decree in 2013, and I think they
9	did about \$150,000 worth of work before we took it over and the
10	moneys were moved to JXN Water.
11	THE COURT: Okay. So this is something that's going
12	to be on the next report or the report after that?
13	MR. HENIFIN: The following one, correct.
14	THE COURT: But nevertheless, it will be the subject
15	of a report, and the public should understand that we are
16	sensitive to the problem and that we are working on it.
17	MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Now, then, is that the
19	end of your report?
20	MR. HENIFIN: I think that's the end of the status
21	report. Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Now, then, don't move. Let's start over
23	here. Do we have any particular question which deals with his
24	subject that you just heard?
25	MR. FINGERHOOD: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you speak for your entire team? 1 2 MS. WILLIAMS: He does, Your Honor. The only thing I 3 would add has nothing to do with this. We would ask for a 4 brief comfort break at the next available moment. 5 **THE COURT:** We are going to do that. This is the 6 next available moment. I just wanted to go down the row and 7 see if there is something else, because then what we are going 8 to do is take a break. And then when we come back after the 9 break, when Mr. Henifin has wet his whistle, then he will be 10 prepared to go to the next point. 11 Now, is there somebody else over here? 12 MR. FURRH: Your Honor, the State doesn't have 13 anything. That would include MDEQ and Mississippi State Department of Health. 14 THE COURT: Have I exhausted this side over here? 15 16 Let's switch sides of the aisle. Over here. 17 MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes. The City of Jackson doesn't have any questions, Your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 20 Do we have anything else on it? Anything else the legal 21 team wants to add on this subject that we just got off? 22 MR. CALAMITA: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: So you are not going to create a 23 24 difficulty for yourself? 25 MR. CALAMITA: No, sir.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Now, it's a status conference, and
2	I want to make sure that anybody who has a question can ask it.
3	So is there anybody sitting in the gallery who has a comment?
4	ACLU?
5	MS. RANEY-GRAY: Your Honor, I don't have anything to
6	add, but I would defer to anything that my colleagues on the
7	Zoom would have to ask.
8	THE COURT: Why don't you stand right there. All
9	right. Colleagues with ACLU, do you all have something that
10	you wish to add or question?
11	MS. EARLY: No, Your Honor, not in relation to the
12	quarterly status report.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else? I don't see any
14	hands. One more time. Anybody? Ms. Early, are you hydrated
15	now?
16	MS. EARLY: Yes, sir.
17	THE COURT: Okay. All right, then. Thank you all.
18	Now, I'm going to move now to our next subject, but we are
19	going to take a break first. My court reporter takes her
20	breaks at certain times, and I always want to make sure that
21	her delicate fingers can get the rest that her fingers deserve.
22	So we are going to take a break, and when we come back, we will
23	talk about the funding. Correct?
24	MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: That will be the next one. So for those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of you out there who are going to be with us on the next one, then look through your notes on funding, grant funding, because Mr. Henifin is going to discuss grant funding and some of the situations that we need to bring to your attention. So we are going to take a 20-minute recess, and my court reporter -- Teri, is that enough time for you? **COURT REPORTER:** Yes, sir. THE COURT: Mr. Henifin, you have been working your vocal cords. Is that enough time for you? MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** Okay, then. Then we are going to come back on grant funding in 20 minutes. We will be in recess until then. (RECESS TAKEN AT 11:41 A.M. UNTIL 12:19 P.M.) **THE COURT:** All right. We are back on the record. Mr. Henifin, are you ready to go forward? MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** The second item for discussion is grant Now, let me just set this topic. When you choose projects and managers who will be working on these various ones for JXN Water, then you have endeavored to only give projects to those people who are reliable, competent, as a good manager There's been a great deal of interest in these should be. projects around the city and outside the city. Companies

outside the state and outside the city have applied. And you

make the determination. I don't get involved in making that determination. That is you. But we have these people who have applied, but early on, we found that there was one particular area in which we had some trust issues in the sense that a lot of the companies that wanted to do business were afraid they weren't going to be paid timely.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Apparently Jackson has developed a reputation of not paying on time. So my first question is, did you find that to be true, that a number of project managers complained that they were not being paid on time?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. We started trying to hire contractors. That was the first thing that a lot of them talked about was how am I going to get paid, how fast am I going to get paid, will I get paid, due to the history they had had in this region.

THE COURT: In fact, I recall one sore topic that astounded me when I was concerned about some of the pipes that carry sewage were stopped up, and I couldn't understand why their condition still persisted. You might remember at one point I was going to pay my own money out of my pocket and have one of these environmental companies come in and drill out some of these pipes. One pipe bothered me so much because it was close to a retirement home.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the sewage, the raw sewage was coming directly out of the ground very close to that retirement home for senior citizens. And I said that I was going to go ahead and go into my own pocket and pay this particular company to come drill out some of the pipes, and I would not actually recompense, and you told me to think carefully on that because I was under the impression that we had one or two bad situations, and the figure you gave me was 257. So then you asked me was I going to do all 257. I didn't know that we had that many. That was the first tour that we had.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So I decided that we needed to check with the system, the City, to see if they had snake trucks, that is, trucks that had the coil, the wire, and they could snake out these particular pipes. I was informed that there were three such trucks that the City owned. So then I thought, well, that takes care of that issue. Just get those trucks out there in the field working, and we could accomplish a lot.

But then you informed me that that was not as simple because the three trucks were not serviceable. And I asked you where were they, and you told me they were in the shop and they had been in the shop for a while.

So then I said, well, why can't we just get them out? And you informed me that the City said that they couldn't get them out right then. Correct?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor, that's my understanding. They didn't have the money to pay the bill at that point.

THE COURT: They didn't have the money to pay the bill. So these trucks were left in the shop. Later on, the City said it bought another truck. I didn't quite understand what moneys they used to buy a truck if they didn't have moneys to get three of them out of the shop, but I need not worry long because that matter was quickly explained, that that new truck broke too. And it went into the shop; is that right?

MR. HENIFIN: I believe so, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, and then after that, we had a problem with no trucks being out there. Well, the fact that the City said, or somebody said the City said, that they didn't have any money to get those trucks out of the shop, was symptomatic of what some of the project managers were telling us about the moneys they expected to be paid for the projects they were working on for the City but could not get paid. So then when JXN Water took over, you had to deal with that image.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So you were very, very concerned that JXN Water would be able to show that it could pay its bills and would pay its bills. So there was a certain protocol set up to pay these amounts, because otherwise, you would have problems and did have some problems with some reputable companies not

desiring to work on Jackson projects, even though by that time, it would be a project under the tutelage of JXN Water, because they were afraid this was merely a carryover from the City.

And so they wanted to be paid because they had employees who otherwise would go somewhere else to work or refuse to work on the projects we wanted them to work on.

So all in all, we took that situation or that reputation that the City had very, very, very seriously and just wanted to be sure whether it was true or not that we paid our bills timely.

So the mechanism that was in place at first was what kind of mechanism? Describe how it first worked before there was a change.

MR. HENTFIN: Yes, Your Honor. The grant -- the grant we are referring to is the larger of the two grants. This is the one that pays for all the projects getting done, and that was awarded to us in May of 2023. At that point in time, the process that's in place, was in place, was the grant moneys would be loaded into this -- basically a portal, online portal system where I could draw them down as necessary to pay invoices and pay expenses. The grant was approved in May was approved at a level of \$115 million and some change, and when I prepared the grant application, you project how much you are going to spend in the first, second, and third year of the grant, and I projected 44 million for that first year. So

every time I needed to pay an invoice, I could go online to the system. That money would be pulled down and put right into our bank account. And at the same time I could be paying the invoice and trying to make sure that the invoice doesn't show up at the bank before the money that the federal government has loaded down. And the system worked very, very well. The federal system puts money in the account the same day if you do it before, like, 2:00 in the day and it is less than a million dollars. Otherwise, it is the next day. The money goes right into our bank account, the bills get paid electronically, the next day, basically, to our contractors.

And we were finding this -- and again, largely I thought this was going to be a challenging system back when we first had conversations with the EPA on how this grant funding would work. It turned out the system worked very, very well, and we got very used to being able to get an invoice, review it and process it for payment within a day or two as opposed to weeks. And our contractors got very comfortable with knowing that they would see a payment in their bank accounts within a few days of them submitting an invoice.

It is critical for our smaller contractors. We have our paving contractors, a very small contractor. He is able to bill monthly. We have got one of our pipe repair contractors that actually invoices us weekly and needs that cash flow to be able to pay his people.

And so everyone is used to this mechanism, which was very successful from May until the end of December, when essentially I had gone through the 44 million, and again, that was a projection made in March of last year before we knew what we were even going to be doing. And they -- I asked for additional funding as I saw that racking up, and 15 more million was put into the account at that point in time.

Since then, we are down to \$73,000 in the account. I'm holding more than \$6 million worth of invoices that need payment, and EPA is talking about changing the process to a reimbursement process. I haven't seen anything official on that, but I do know that the bank account is empty essentially at this point in time. I'm sitting on invoices that should have been paid weeks ago. So as a result, they are talking about switching to a reimbursement process.

You realize I have no cash reserves, so in a reimbursement process, the way they've done one invoice so far is I submit the invoice to EPA in DC, they review it, they process it, they okay it, then they put money in the bank account, and then I can pay the contractor. Lots of steps and lots of time lost. I'm really concerned, if that processed continued, what would happen in a potential government shutdown, but we haven't had one yet. We might have one in the next week or so. But it is adding significant time and administrative challenges to our paying our contractors. We are deviating from what they are

used to. I'm getting a lot of calls and e-mails from contractors saying, hey, what did I do wrong, why haven't I gotten paid yet, recognizing that it is a very different process today than it was in December that got us to this point.

Largely we have built a great rapport with our contractors. Our success is based on the fact that they are doing wonderful work for us, they respond when we need them, they work long hours, they work during emergencies, and that's because you build a relationship with the contractor that they can trust what you are saying and you can trust that they are doing what they need to do. We are kind of violating that at this point.

So my ask today, Judge, is just that if EPA is going to consider a change from that original process, that they bring it to you first so we can understand the merits and the reasons and decide how to go forward from there.

THE COURT: So at this point, what is the amount of money that you are expected to pay out on invoices?

MR. HENIFIN: I'm holding about \$6 million worth of invoices today.

THE COURT: Today. And you have, what did you say, \$75,000 in the bank?

MR. HENIFIN: 73.

THE COURT: 73. Not even the benefit of that extra

1 2,000. So just \$,000.

MR. HENIFIN: \$73,000 and some change.

THE COURT: And some change on this 6 million-dollar outstanding bill.

MR. HENIFIN: I'm a little concerned about letting people continue to work without knowing that I've got money to pay them. That's my reputation and trust on the line.

THE COURT: Because when you engage these project managers from time to time, you are engaging them to do emergency work.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. Almost everything we are doing is under a time and material emergency type of contract.

THE COURT: So when you call them up and you tell them you have a problem at a certain address of a certain quantity of problem or a volume, then you have homeowners who are waiting for that to be rectified. So the homeowner now is disturbed because nothing happens, because the project managers don't go out there because they are afraid they aren't going to be paid.

MR. HENIFIN: We haven't gotten there yet, but that is sort of the direction I think we are headed.

THE COURT: Well, that's why I brought this up, because at present, if you have \$6 million already due and owing, some of these project managers might not be as excited

about working for JXN Water, just like they weren't excited about working for the City of Jackson --

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: -- when Jackson was going through these problems. That's one of the first major problems we encountered when we started working on all of these various projects, that these people didn't want to come in and work for the City, and the City had an awful reputation for not being able to pay its bills.

You know, we heard all kinds of horror stories how long some of these project managers had been waiting around for their money, and thus they weren't interested in taking on another project after they had not been paid on the first project.

So that was a huge concern of ours. Wouldn't you agree?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We thought we had addressed it when we first started paying off some of these project managers within a certain amount of time, and these people then saw a distinction between the protocol of JXN Water as opposed to what they had imagined from the City of Jackson. But under the system as it has now developed, it looks like we are being slammed back into that same system that had befallen the city of Jackson. Wouldn't you agree?

MR. HENIFIN: We are definitely headed that

1 direction, yes.

THE COURT: So now we have a number of invoices that have not been serviced and a number of contractors who have a bitter taste in their mouth now developing.

Now, to what extent have you been successful in explaining to these contractors that we are working on that project, that we are working on getting their moneys as fast as we can.

MR. HENIFIN: So I've been informing them as they have asked. I haven't put any broad statement out across, but as they've asked why they haven't been paid yet, I've said there has been a change in EPA, and most of them all say, that's how the government works. They kind of resigned -- they figured that kind of thing would happen at some point. It's not how we would like to continue to do business.

THE COURT: I know that when I got involved in this that persons with invoices were calling, first of all, to try to determine how long it's going to be but thankful that they were being paid timely. And one of the first compliments that I heard on behalf of JXN Water and you was that they were being paid timely and thus did not worry about accepting subsequent contracts. And now some people are beginning to call about this whole matter. But it's not much you can do if your moneys have not been released. Am I correct?

MR. HENIFIN: That is correct. I have no reserves.

I can't front the money from any pot of money that I don't

I'm reserveless, so it's a challenge. 1 2 **THE COURT:** Right now you have about \$73,000. 3 do you expect to be able to draw down on your next installment? 4 MR. HENIFIN: EPA told me in an e-mail yesterday I 5 should expect to hear something today or tomorrow on ten 6 million dollars to pay these bills. 7 **THE COURT:** That you should expect to hear something 8 on ten million? 9 (Nodding affirmatively). MR. HENIFIN: THE COURT: That would take care of our outstanding 10 invoices, correct? 11 12 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 13 **THE COURT:** And leave a little bit over for the next 14 group that's going to surface. MR. HENIFIN: Correct, probably early March. 15 16 **THE COURT:** What does that say for the future? Will 17 we have to go through the same problems again in the future 18 where these contractors and contract managers say that they 19 have outstanding invoices and that we have to fear that some of 20 these contractors will lump us into the same category, 21 reputational category, that the City was in when we started? MR. HENIFIN: The future is a little cloudy at the 22 23 moment. 24 THE COURT: So what do you have as a solution to this 25 particular matter so that we don't run into this particular

problem? Because just imagine, as I'm sure you have and already experience nightmares over it, that here you have been making tremendous progress on the city's woes concerning sewage and water, as you described earlier today, that you are winning back the confidence of the citizenry, that now they are saying we have pressure, we are having rapid responses, but all that is contingent upon your work crews being able to complete their work timely. If they walked off the job or refused to take the job, then that's going to be a tremendous setback.

MR. HENIFIN: Absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So then what -- and I also recognize that the kind of reputation that you are aiming for JXN Water to earn is wrapped up with how the public views you yourself, because they are calling you asking for their money. And you are the ones who selected them in the first place to do this work, and you are the one who are asking these contractors to go out in the middle of the night, early mornings, and perform this work, perform it well and quickly. And so then there's a trust element here that they know that if they stop working on some other small job over here and take this bigger job over here for the City, that they are going to be paid timely. And if you can't pay them timely and don't pay them timely, they could lose trust in you, in which case they might do what they start doing with the City, which is pay us first or show us that you can pay us before we go out to do any work, because

you already owe us on some other invoices.

So then to be sure that we don't have this kind of situation in the future where you are down to \$73,000, where you have six million dollars worth of invoices, what do you propose?

MR. HENIFIN: Well, my proposal would be to return to the status quo where the grant funding is loaded in annual chunks into the system so I can drop down as these costs are extended. This grant is an emergency measures grant under an authorization that has never been used before, and it's supposed to be just for this, for quick work to resolve emergency situations. EPA has not used this grant, that I'm aware of, before. We are learning together, and I think it has proven to be very successful in how much we have succeeded to fix the system in a short period of time.

I also recognize it is also a bridge, because this grant will end, because we have got \$150 million authorization total in the grant. We have gone through 60 million of it already in the first year. It will get us another year, maybe year and a half before we need to be generating enough local revenue to not be dependent on that grant to offset these costs. But we need that time, and we need this money now to get us to that point in time, recognizing that this is an emergency grant, short in duration but critical from getting us from where we are today to where we need to be, recovering revenue locally,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

generating the money we need to make these repairs and do this O & M work with our own local dollars, which we are confident and laid out in the financial plan that this year we expect to collect 80 percent of what is owed us, the next year 85, and the next year 90, and the following year 95. And the bridge in all of that is, for the first 3 years, this federal grant. And without that, we just don't have the revenue to offset and have reserves and make the payment.

And they aren't saying they aren't going to give us the rest of the 150 million, but the way they are trying to deliver it is making it very challenging, for the reasons you've just If we went back to the status quo, which was they loaded 44 million into the grant based on the first year projection, they added money to it when I said the projections weren't exact, because we were shooting blind anyway, and in March of 2023, when we set that in place, they would load the next year's amount into the system so I could draw that down to keep paying the bills that we are incurring right now, and when we get to the end of that, get down to around 5 million is when I sounded the alarm in November. I was at five million, and I said we are going to need more of that, at 15, to get us to the end of the year. And I started sounding the alarm that that was going away and we needed additional funds, and that's when we started getting into this whole reimbursement process.

If we went back to the status quo, I think everything

1 would be great. 2 THE COURT: And how well are we doing on 3 accountability? 4 MR. HENIFIN: We can provide invoices for every penny 5 of federal dollars we have expended out of that grant. We can 6 tie it exactly to the contractor through an invoice on every 7 penny of the 55 million and change we have spent to date. THE COURT: And I have talked to you about this. 8 9 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, you have. 10 **THE COURT:** And the figures that I need to examine to see what accountability there is for every dime, every penny, 11 12 that's available, is it not? 13 MR. HENIFIN: Yes. In my quarterly report, I even listed all of the invoices for that quarter against every 14 15 project that was there. So it's very easy to review and see. 16 **THE COURT:** Okay. So then since you have gone 17 through the Court, that is, through me on this, then I have a record of these things, correct? 18 19 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 20 **THE COURT:** And so then I understand the projects, 21 who is providing them, how much they will cost, and what the payments are going to be for all of those. That's the check 22 23 and balance on this point, correct? 24 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Because we can't have a system that's set

up without accountability. 1 2 MR. HENIFIN: Agreed. 3 **THE COURT:** And also we need a system that is 4 transparent. 5 MR. HENIFIN: Agreed. 6 **THE COURT:** Because we are using the public coffers 7 And so we have always agreed on these things, have we here. not? 8 9 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** So then now that we have identified what 10 11 could be a serious thorn in our side on credibility, because 12 here we are in the midst of having the same kind of 13 self-abasing flaw that it seems the City had when it was given the reputation of not making payments, we have to do something 14 15 with that if we are going to continue to enjoy the trust of our 16 vendors, correct? 17 MR. HENIFIN: Correct. THE COURT: Otherwise, we can't count on calling 18 19 these people in the middle of the night and telling them to go 20 do things. 21 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 22 **THE COURT:** So now you have gotten some moneys from 23 What dialogue have you had with EPA on this particular circumstance? 24 25 MR. HENIFIN: So there was a compliance assistance

team that visited us in mid November, and they were concerned about tying the individual drawdowns back to individual invoices, which at the time I didn't know that that was really a main concern of theirs.

So since that time, we have been recording individual invoices against each draw that we make against the grant, which should satisfy that requirement. We haven't been able to go back and spend the time to do the forensics to identify each draw that was done previously, back as early as March -- I mean, as May, to show how that tied to a particular invoice. We are drawing money down, trying to pay things, did not understand that there was a recordkeeping requirement like that. I still haven't found where that shows in any of the grant agreement documents.

What I did agree to in the grant agreement was that money that was pulled down would be obligated within five days or up to 15 days. The goal is five but up to 15 days. And currently I only draw money down as I'm paying invoices, so it is obligated within hours of money hitting the bank account.

But again, compliance assistance came down to see how we were doing. Those have been fast and furious, first time this grant has been used. I think if that was the only issue, we have of course corrected it now to make sure we have that information for future audits or looks or assistance visits, but what we do have is invoices that tie to every penny that

has been drawn down and used. We just couldn't tie specific invoices to specific drawdowns early in this process.

So the dialogue with them has been they will issue some letter or report -- I have yet to see any of that -- that will change this from the current process to a reimbursement process. And in the interim, I'm just having conversations with the grant office at EPA, to have them put money in the account in some form or fashion so I can pay bills, and I'm at their mercy as to when that happens and how that happens.

THE COURT: But you are not in favor of their reimbursement system?

MR. HENIFIN: I just don't see how it can work because I don't have reserves to front -- you know, if we get into this delay of them providing a reimbursement, I have got no money to pay these invoices. Quite frankly, I don't really want to tell contractors to go out and work if I don't know that I have money in the bank to pay them.

That's a really challenging contractual situation. Most people don't enter a contract, especially in the federal government, without having money to pay it. So I have got an IOU potentially to pay my bills. I'm not very comfortable not having the money in the bank to make this happen.

THE COURT: Contrast the amount of time it would take to pay the contractors under the reimbursement system as opposed to the system that you favor.

MR. HENIFIN: I've got one example because we have done one complete reimbursement. It was for a Jacobs invoice. Jacobs is the contractor operating the treatment plants on a reimbursement basis right now. So we get a pretty extensive invoice from them on a monthly basis. I had a 2.5 million and change invoice that I didn't have money to pay. EPA asked me to submit it to them in DC and they would process it and approve it and then move money. So that process took about two weeks. Normally I would have just taken the invoice, reviewed it in a few hours, and then drawn the money down and processed the payment probably the next day. So they've gone from within a day or two to within two to three weeks of receiving it.

I'm not sure what they do when they are reviewing this.

I'm not sure what they do when they are reviewing this.

If they've got questions or stop payment or -- I mean, I've already incurred the cost. I've authorized the contractor to work. Someone in DC decides that something is wrong with an invoice and stops payment? They aren't even here. They aren't familiar. I don't know what value they can add from reviewing these invoices.

THE COURT: I asked you that question. Have you got an answer as to --

MR. HENIFIN: I still don't know where we are. They haven't given me anything in writing as to why we are in this predicament, what the ultimate outcome is going to be, when I can expect a writing from them. I've got nothing to bring in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

front of you and say, Judge, this isn't working because I don't know what process we are in, other than I don't have money to pay bills, and I used to have money to pay bills. **THE COURT:** So where are we now? MR. HENIFIN: Waiting on ten million to show up in the bank today, tomorrow. **THE COURT:** And then after that? MR. HENIFIN: Pardon? **THE COURT:** And then after that? MR. HENIFIN: I will start asking again for the next amount of money so that I don't run out again, hopefully. **THE COURT:** Will that have any bearing on what contracts you are letting? MR. HENIFIN: It depends on how this all plays out. I can't tell you yet, Your Honor, where all of this lands. I can just tell you I'm very uncomfortable having folks work on a time and material contract with no ability to pay them. **THE COURT:** This 6 million you mentioned, that's the sum total right now that's outstanding? MR. HENIFIN: In rough numbers, yes, sir. They are still working today. One of those contractors is the one that bills weekly. I have got two bills from two weeks ago, two bills from last week, and I expect to see two invoices by the end of this week from that one contractor. It's a very small contractor doing great work for us, but they will be waiting on

1 half a million dollars by the end of this week, which is a make 2 or break for a small contractor. He has bought equipment, he 3 is working hard for us, put in safety requirements, doing 4 everything we asked them to do, and now we are going to be 5 dragging our feet in getting them their payments. 6 **THE COURT:** Who has been your contact person with 7 EPA? 8 MR. HENIFIN: It would be great to say there was one. There is one in the office of water, grants. She has been very 9 cooperative, very helpful, has no control or relation over the 10 11 office of grants and debarment, which are the ones that have to 12 approve the money to go in. We have asked for a single point 13 of contact, a decision-maker somewhere in EPA, because these two silos don't talk to each other, and they have not been able 14 15 to provide us who that person we can go to when we are having a 16 challenge like this. 17 **THE COURT:** So you are in limbo? 18 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 19 **THE COURT:** How long have you been in limbo? 20 MR. HENIFIN: Since the end of December, beginning of 21 January. **THE COURT:** So that's January, all of March -- I 22 23 mean, January --24 MR. HENIFIN: All of February. We have two days of 25 February left.

THE COURT: Right. All of February. 1 2 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir. 3 THE COURT: And you still don't know when the money 4 is coming in? 5 MR. HENIFIN: No, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** Just any day now? 6 7 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** What about counsel over here for EPA? 8 9 MR. HENIFIN: I would love to hear what they have to say about it, Your Honor. 10 11 THE COURT: Have you spoken with them? 12 MR. HENIFIN: No, I have not. 13 **THE COURT:** You've called up the principals, I take it. 14 15 MR. HENIFIN: I have been talking to the staff that's 16 been working -- we did have -- my lawyers had conversations 17 with the Department of Justice. Remember, you called a status 18 conference a few weeks ago related to this issue because I was 19 highlighting it, and they agreed to make some quick changes and 20 make that payment for the 2.5, which didn't take days, it took 21 weeks, but we agreed to delay the status conference on the good word that they would fix this, but it hasn't been done. 22 23 THE COURT: When you were referring just then to your 24 team, you pointed towards your team of lawyers. 25 MR. HENIFIN: Mr. Calamita, I believe, had direct

conversations with Mr. Fingerhood. 1 2 Is there any particular reason why you THE COURT: 3 had to go through your lawyers? 4 MR. HENIFIN: Because things weren't happening at the staff level. 5 6 **THE COURT:** Well, what I'm getting to is, was there 7 any concern that you could end up in a lawsuit because of the 8 failure of these moneys to come forward? 9 MR. HENIFIN: I don't think I was really worried about a lawsuit, but I just thought we needed to get this 10 11 rectified at some level where we could continue to work the way 12 we were working before, and it didn't seem to be happening with 13 the staff members at EPA that were helpful but not able to resolve it. 14 15 THE COURT: Is there any specific time period 16 mentioned in the contract as to when these vendors would be 17 paid? 18 MR. HENIFIN: No, Your Honor. 19 **THE COURT:** Did any of the contractors ask for a time 20 period? 21 MR. HENIFIN: Most of them had a standard net 30. 22 **THE COURT:** Say that again. 23 Payment within 30 days. MR. HENIFIN: 24 **THE COURT:** Payment within 30 days? 25 MR. HENIFIN: And we are still beating that at this

1	point, but that's not the level of service we've established.
2	We want to pay within a week, again, to build that trust, to
3	make sure they are ready to jump when a deep freeze hits. We
4	had 16 crews working round the clock. They are doing that
5	because we have built a great relationship with these
6	contractors. So as that starts eroding, because we are going
7	to take advantage of every day we have got to wait to pay them
8	until the 30th day, that's just not how you build trust. It's
9	not how you build relationships.
10	THE COURT: If I ask a question which invades
11	attorney-client relationship, then you don't have to answer.
12	But based on what your attorneys have told you about their
13	negotiations with the EPA, are you optimistic there might be
14	some favorable change?
15	MR. HENIFIN: No, Your Honor, not from where we stand
16	today.
17	THE COURT: What does that mean? That you think EPA
18	will still endorse or embrace a system which does not work?
19	MR. HENIFIN: I believe so, Your Honor, but I've yet
20	to again, I'm flying blind, not having anything in writing,
21	nothing to base that on other than phone calls and
22	conversations.
23	THE COURT: Are you satisfied that you have laid out
24	your case to EPA as well as you can?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

25

THE COURT: All right. Will you have a seat, please, 1 2 and I will come right back to you in just a moment. Mr. Fingerhood, did you follow this discussion? 3 4 MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, I did, Your Honor. 5 **THE COURT:** So please dip into that reservoir of 6 wisdom you possess and tell us how to work this out. 7 MR. FINGERHOOD: It might be more of a kiddie pool, but I appreciate the judge's confidence. 8 9 THE COURT: If it's going to work it out, that's fine. 10 11 MR. FINGERHOOD: We have -- we appreciate Ted's 12 comments and concerns, and we have been and we will be 13 discussing them further within EPA and DOJ and would like the opportunity to discuss with Ted's attorneys and Ted. 14 15 You know, the grant process is a complex process. 16 know, they have their own set of rules. And, you know, I do 17 want to say that the federal government is not the city, that so far we have maintained our full faith and credit as far as 18 19 paying our bills, so I think that's a distinguishing factor. 20 So, you know, I think their -- as Ted alluded to, there's 21 a learning curve here when we initially negotiated the stipulated order, we didn't know about the money that Congress 22 23 was going to appropriate. And they did eventually appropriate \$6 million of money that is specific to -- can only be used for 24

Safe Drinking Water Act costs. So it's an unfortunate

25

circumstance that this happened, but there is a grants process. As Ted said, there has been no final decision made about this process, but, you know, when the contracts are net 30 and he's still meeting the contracts, it seems like there hasn't been, you know, a violation there.

So I understand the confidence building, but it is -- the federal government has, you know, provided these grant funds, but they are subject to federal grant rules, and so we -- you know, we have recently become aware of, you know, some differences of opinion between, you know, Ted, as he indicated he wants to pay these right away, and on the other hand, there's kind of the process of, you know, what the grants office does. You know, there has to be a balance there.

So, you know, as Ted acknowledged, there is no final decision, nothing before the Court right now, but we would like to -- we have had some initial discussions with Ted's attorney, and we would like to continue with those dialogues both with our client and with Mr. Calamita and his client and, you know, see where those goes before this -- if it does end up before the Court.

THE COURT: Well, you have stated that there's a difference in the responsible parties for the moneys, the federal government versus the City of Jackson. I appreciate that, in a limited way, that if I am a vendor on the system and I need some money to pay my bills and that money is held up for

an inordinate long time, as what the City has been accused of, then it doesn't matter what the identity is, whether it's the federal government or the state government. What's important is that I didn't get paid. What's important is that my debt obligations went unheeded. And further, what's important is that I'm losing workers who want to be paid, regardless. So do you see any way out of this predicament at this point?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, I would like to explore discussions further both within DOJ, EPA, and with the ITPM and its counsel. But as I mentioned too, this is a large amount of federal funds, and, you know, there are their own set of requirements for the use of the funds. And so it is kind of a balancing act. I think -- I think a lot of government contractors may think that, you know, getting paid within a week is somewhat unheard of. I think it's -- as Ted indicated, it's probably more like a 30-day payment period is more of the norm and may even be longer. I think that's maybe the commercial norm. It may even be longer for government contracts.

Like I said, I'm stepping into the baby pool. I'm not a contract lawyer or a grants lawyer, but I am learning a lot, as well as learning about SNAP, which we will be discussing a little later too.

So I think we would like to, at least before something comes before the Court, have an opportunity to engage in this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

dialogue and see where it ends. And I think that was similar to what Ted was proposing is that if there does remain a difference of opinion, it would be teed up for the Court appropriately. Right now there hasn't been any final agency decision that would be reviewable. There's an administrative process for that. And there are other issues remaining, and it may be that those can be teed up for Your Honor.

I would just like to have it resolved as THE COURT: fast as possible because the matters of the heart concerning reputation are difficult to reverse once they are set in stone. And for those contractors who have lived in this looking glass involving the City, when they felt like they weren't getting paid, and the City's reputation, whether rightly or wrongly attributed, has permeated down to the workers, who are the ones who prepare the actual finished product. And when their authority figures say, we just don't have the money to pay you because we haven't been paid, then the workers don't care whether it's the federal government or the state government. All they know is that they performed a chore for which they didn't get paid, and they have bills from other persons who really don't care who is responsible for those bills, but they didn't get paid, and they then started looking around outside of town just trying to see if they can hook on with somebody else who can employ them, and if they have to go outside the state to get a job, then they are lost to us for the duration

of that particular contract.

So that could have lasting effect upon us where we are trying to get these matters done as fast as possible and also to make sure that people know this is not any critical company that they had problems with before, if they had problems.

Now, of course, we don't know the extent of what those problems may have been that they said they have, but we really don't want to have to get into that. We don't want to have to call out anybody else or to say how we are in a much better position than somebody else. We just want to have the moneys available to us so that we can go ahead and pay these people.

Now, I asked you at the top of our dialogue here whether you would be able to call upon your vast experience and tell us what we need to do in order to make this process seamless. As you stand there now, do you have thoughts on the matter?

Because won't you be the lead person who will have to talk to the folk back in DC who may not have even been down here?

MR. FINGERHOOD: On that last point, I will not be the ultimate decider. Those will be the people above me.

THE COURT: Won't you be making recommendations?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I will be making recommendations.

THE COURT: That's what I'm getting to.

MR. FINGERHOOD: We have had some initial discussions with Ted's attorney, but we do have a confidentiality order, and I think we would be better engaging in those discussions

subject to that before I just start airing my own personal views in court.

THE COURT: Okay. But you will be involved in the process?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Oh, yes, and others at DOJ and EPA.

And like I said, we intend to have a dialogue, not just on the government's side but with Ted and his attorneys.

And you know, just going back to another point the Court raised, I understood -- and I'm sorry to refer to him as Ted.

MR. HENIFIN: It doesn't bother me.

MR. FINGERHOOD: You can call me Karl.

But, you know, we've known each other a couple of years, so I apologize for the informality before the Court. But Mr. Henifin indicated that, you know, his preference is to pay within I think he said five days, and he's experienced 2 to 3 weeks, but I don't think he has said anybody has fallen outside of that 30-day window.

Now, I understand his concern with the reputation, but I do think, you know, that the contractors are still getting paid within kind of what their expectations are. So, you know, it hasn't fallen outside of that, and, of course, I think that's a good thing. But I think the contractors are getting paid within the time frame they expect. When they get paid sooner than that, I'm sure they appreciate that, but, you know, I think as a lawyer, if you look at the contract, it says payment

within 30 days, and that's what you can expect. 1 2 THE COURT: Now, on this process. How long do you think it would take before you have a suggestion to Mr. 3 4 Henifin? 5 MR. FINGERHOOD: I mean, again, I think we would like 6 to address -- we would like to address this in the near future. 7 **THE COURT:** And what is near future? MR. FINGERHOOD: You know, I would say within two to 8 9 three weeks, and that's kind of an outside time frame. THE COURT: Now, that's a pretty long time, isn't it, 10 two or three weeks? 11 12 MR. FINGERHOOD: Not considering that, again, you are 13 dealing with -- you know, we have to bring in certain decision-makers from EPA and DOJ and then work with Mr. Henifin 14 15 and his counsel, I don't think it's too unreasonable. 16 **THE COURT:** Well, now, you, yourself, have a stake in 17 this matter because you certainly want EPA to be highly 18 regarded in its efforts to assist Jackson here, but there's 19 another reason too. Now, you have been down here an awful lot in the last few months. Do you consider yourself now a citizen 20 of Jackson? 21 MR. FINGERHOOD: I have spent a great deal of time, 22 and I do enjoy my trips here. There are great people, great 23 24 food, and soon to be a great water and sewer system. 25 THE COURT: Now, have you bought a house down here

yet?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Not yet, but I did show my wife something that -- I saw a list that said Mississippi was -- listed somewhere as one of the least expensive places to retire.

THE COURT: Well, you've been down here an awful lot, and so you are like a citizen of Jackson now. So you want to make sure your water is okay and your sewage is all right.

Correct?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes.

THE COURT: That's what I thought.

MR. FINGERHOOD: And I think that's not just me personally but that's shared by EPA, and I think just, you know, based on the feedback we got in connection with the Clean Water Act stipulated order, the citizens are seeing some results too, which is great news for everyone.

THE COURT: I know you are going to try to work this matter out as fast as you can, but as soon as you get some suggestion here, could you shoot a letter to me, as well as the other parties here, what your suggestion is, unless you are of the opinion that it still should be confidential?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, we will advise the Court, and either publicly or under seal, if appropriate, but we can do it.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

Now, then, Mr. Henifin, are there any other points on this matter of grant funding that you need to discuss with the Court.

MR. HENIFIN: Could I have my counsel speak?
THE COURT: Sure.

MR. CALAMITA: Thank you, Your Honor. I will be brief. Paul Calamita for Mr. Henifin.

First of all, I want to say Mr. Fingerhood and EPA have had communication with me trying to, for the moment, maintain the status quo while this matter is brought to Your Honor's attention for resolution.

I did want to mention, just my first point would be, I want no more burdens, no more red tape, no more process on Mr. Henifin than we absolutely need to have. While he gets up here and gives you kind of a happy story of all the progress, what I don't want anybody to lose sight of is this is unprecedented. Every single thing Mr. Henifin does is a life of the utility event for other utilities around the country, well-run utilities with money, huge challenges, managing grants, water sewer program. All these projects that you hear about, the water plants, the distribution system, the sewage treatment plants and the collection system, this is unprecedented. This hasn't been done before. I didn't think he was that good. And I'm going to tell you, I know nobody who could replace him.

But the band width for continuing -- you know, things are

only going to get harder as he tries to have a financial management plan and an ultimate structure for this. But no more burdens, and I see this as a burden. That's number one.

Number two, the review, the post work review by EPA officials in Washington creates uncertainty as to whether he's is going to get paid. Mr. Henifin told you he has \$73,000. For a public utility to have \$73,000 is like the five cents you put in your sock drawer when you go home at night, Your Honor. That is no money.

The first time EPA kicks something back and says, this is not right, we have nothing to pay it. And all of that trust, everything just collapses.

And the third point, which I think is the most important point, Your Honor, we have a grant agreement that says Mr. Henifin can pull down money, that -- the regulation doesn't say it, but EPA's guidance and the grant condition says he needs to pay out within five days. So if he pulls down a million dollars, the grant agreement says you pay it out within 5 days. The grant agreement doesn't say it is done on a reimbursement basis. That is a punishment for somebody who is not operating in accordance with the grant agreement.

We think we are operating in accordance with the grant agreement, so we would love to maintain the status quo for the reasons I have mentioned. If EPA feels that somehow we are not in compliance, we would like to see that in writing, Your

Honor, because I have not seen that. And I think we can cross that bridge if we see that, but I really do think that -- I heard Mr. Fingerhood say we are going to kind of maintain the status quo until they make some decisions. I think that can be the end of it for today, Your Honor. But I did want to impress upon you that going to the reimbursement basis puts more time and effort on my client, and there needs to be a really good reason, because it will take him away from doing the things for the citizens who have suffered long enough.

And I guess the last thing I should say is, Mr. Henifin competes with everybody around him for contractors. We are short contractors. We are short everybody, but we are particularly short contractors. And the idea that they came to Jackson to be part of the solution, but we still compete with the surrounding communities for those contractors. And these are some big projects. We have got to pull people from different parts of the country.

So paying promptly is one of the things we can do to make sure that they continue to respond to our calls, because our citizens have suffered too long. And if paying promptly helps get sewage out of their yards and their street and maintain water for their houses, we need to pay promptly, not within 30 days, Your Honor.

I will be happy to answer any questions. Otherwise, I'm done.

THE COURT: So not within 30 days but to pay promptly. So put some meat on that skeleton. What do you mean by pay promptly? It's -- apparently, it's some time period which is less than 30 days.

MR. CALAMITA: We are looking for a competitive advantage over the other utilities around us who do not have the problems and whose folks have not suffered like ours have. One of the ways we can do that, Your Honor, is paying them almost immediately, which is the practice of Mr. Henifin. No one else does that. So we are trying to overcome decades of not getting paid and people not wanting to work for Jackson. We have that today. Mr. Henifin has been trying to hire some other professionals who will not work for JXN Water. It continues until this day. You didn't get an audit when you were supposed to get an audit, Your Honor, because the auditors won't -- I'm not sure if we even --

MR. HENIFIN: We finally got one.

MR. CALAMITA: We finally got one. But we were told no. So there's a lot of folks -- and there is also some liability with this system, Your Honor, that the surrounding utilities don't have. Their utilities function pretty well. If you come in and you are a contractor for Mr. Henifin, you are taking on some risk, that this weak utility -- you know, it is off life support, but we are still in kind of critical, critical condition. We are not stable. And if you are a

contractor, you know you are taking on more liability than if you go work across the river or across a jurisdictional line on a much more stable system. So one of the things we can do is pay them promptly.

We don't think that hurts the federal government. It's consistent with our grant, Your Honor. And we don't think Jackson should be punished by having to go to a reimbursement basis. That said, we are having conversation, we are open to hear any concern, but I have yet to hear a single concern, Your Honor, that causes me to think we are not fully in compliance with our grant agreement.

THE COURT: Now, I asked Mr. Fingerhood to keep me informed as to any suggestion that EPA might offer on this matter. What I have from you thus far is that 30 days may be too long for a vendor to await payment, whereas a lesser period is more preferrable. So can you tell me where you are on this point between those two extremes?

MR. CALAMITA: Mr. Henifin pays me promptly, Your Honor, and I greatly appreciate it, personally, but one of the charges for Mr. Henifin was to try to use as many local contractors. And he has gone out and spent a lot of time with those folks to make sure you are going to get good value, that they know what they are doing, they are going to fix it right the first time, they are going to get good value, they clean the streets. I've see them after hours, Your Honor, 5, 6,

1	7:00, out there sweeping up, which you never saw before. They
2	are motivated. And prompt payment and confidence in prompt
3	payment, not that somebody in Washington can trump Mr.
4	Henifin's decisions about his contract I think that sends a
5	terrible message. So the reimbursement approach I don't think
6	is wise for the system, certainly at this time, and I'm not
7	aware of any problems that would warrant that punitive change
8	in the relationship.
9	But again, I do appreciate the agencies trying to maintain
10	the status quo right now as we try to work through these
11	things. I think Mr. Fingerhood's commitment to you to alert
12	you if the agencies do feel they need to propose a change is a
13	good way to leave things for this afternoon, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: What is the critical time period that the
15	contractors ordinarily would respond to this as too much time?
16	MR. CALAMITA: Respond to
17	THE COURT: That they might say this is too much time
18	to wait.
19	MR. CALAMITA: Well, their invoices provide for 30
20	days, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: So any time period beyond 30 days?
22	MR. CALAMITA: Any time period beyond
23	THE COURT: But the contractors like to be paid prior
24	to 30 days, right?
25	MR. CALAMITA: I think the key here is that Mr.

Henifin has a course of dealing and a course of performance with these contractors, and if they see a change in that, the antenna goes up, because of decades of working in Jackson. And if they find out that now there are contracts that he's already signed, Your Honor, quite frankly, on your behalf -- he works for you -- whether it gets paid or not is now subject to somebody in Washington's decision, I'm not sure that contractors who are spending a lot of time and money are going to be happy to understand that.

Normally, as Ted said, when a public entity signs a contract, they have the dollars in the bank, they know they can pay it. It's not subject to somebody else to decide whether they can pay it or not. So this is a very unusual circumstance. And again, unless EPA can identify specific noncompliance with the grant, Your Honor, we think we should maintain the status quo.

THE COURT: My last question, still related to my former question, when do we get into that murky water where a contractor says, this is too long? One week, two weeks, three weeks?

MR. CALAMITA: I think for the smaller ones, Mr. Henifin has tried to use local folks. And we have found some fantastic local folks who are doing great work. And you heard he gets invoices twice a week, Your Honor. And those people, you know, prompt payment really matters to those small

me.

contractors. And, quite frankly, there's a lot of work around, and we would like to keep them. We would like to maintain that course of performance.

I can't tell you, Your Honor, if they got paid in two or three weeks instead of two or three days, whether that would change whether they want to work with Mr. Henifin, but I think if I am them, I would want to understand why is this change necessary. Has Mr. Henifin done something wrong? Is money running out? Change like that in payment, there is usually a reason, and that will cause some anxiety. And quite frankly, I worry they may think twice when the phone rings and Mr. Henifin needs them to do something. So that's what we would want to avoid unless there is a very good reason, Your Honor, to go to that type of process.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Mr. Fingerhood, is there something else you want to add to this?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Not at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I will await your submission to

MR. FINGERHOOD: Actually, on that, I think what we would prefer is that we -- if there is something like that, we would communicate it first to Ted and his counsel.

THE COURT: I expect that.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Before --

THE COURT: I expect that. Thank you so much.

Anything else, Mr. Henifin? 1 MR. HENIFIN: On that issue, no. Ready to move to 2 SNAP? Do we have a little bit of time to deal with that or 3 4 not? 5 THE COURT: Well, I tell you what. We have two more 6 items to discuss, SNAP being the most important on it, and then 7 there is one more after that. Correct? MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Let's do SNAP, and then -- let's see -is there anybody here who is either diabetic or suffering from 10 11 some ailment where you need to eat on time, because you are 12 already late, but nevertheless, where you need to eat before a 13 certain time period, where we could allocate 30 minutes for SNAP, and I think that -- and then Mr. Henifin, what's that 14 15 last one? 16 MR. HENIFIN: It was the Lakeland Seniors, and I 17 think we could postpone altogether, Your Honor, rather than 18 deal with that. 19 THE COURT: You had said that. Let's just do SNAP 20 and we can come back on another date and do this last one. 21 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** That's on giving permission for the 22 23 possibility of a lawsuit. Counsel, you are standing up. Come

MR. BAILEY: I represent Lakeland Seniors. I'm Simon

forward.

24

25

1 Bailey. And if the Court wants to defer that motion, that is 2 I was just going to ask to be excused if that's the 3 case. 4 THE COURT: Okay. On that particular matter, how 5 much time do you think you need for that argument on that. 6 MR. BAILEY: I don't think much time at all. I think 7 I can speak for five minutes, they could speak for five or ten, 8 and I could rebut in five, so it shouldn't take long. 9 is up to them whether they are ready to go forward on that today or would rather defer it. Again, I'm open to either. 10 11 THE COURT: Let me ask you, I know Mr. Henifin had 12 made a statement to me earlier that that matter might not be 13 ripe yet. Mr. Henifin, am I correct? MR. HENIFIN: No, Your Honor, I think we are pretty 14 15 The decision you make here may influence some other 16 issues we have pending as well. So we were ready to do this 17 I think we have made the full motion. We have 18 everything we need. I think opposing counsel has got what they 19 need. It is a matter of you hearing it, and we can put the 20 SNAP off and come back next week or whenever you want to schedule it. 21 **THE COURT:** I kind of wanted to go ahead and hear on 22 23 SNAP. Counsel, you are standing? 24 MR. MCGUFFEY: Yeah, Your Honor, I would sort of echo 25 what Mr. Henifin said. The matter has been fully briefed.

think briefing closed on the motion for leave sometime in November, and actually, we have worked well together. They have held off serving the underlying lawsuit which has been served against the City of Jackson and against UMMC. They have held off serving us sort of in deference to your authority to be able to decide whether or not they can move forward or not. So I do think the matter is ripe to be decided.

I would also add that there has been a second motion for leave to file suit filed by a totally unrelated party, not represented by Mr. Bailey, that has at least a portion -- raises at least a portion of the same argument. So whether it gets decided today or sometime soon, I do think we are going to need to hear from the Court on some of those core issues, especially those issues that are relevant to both motions.

I would agree with his time frame if we want to take it up today, but again, Mr. Bailey and I both work down the street, so you are on the more locally issues, and you don't need Mr. Calamita and Mr. Fingerhood present for those if you want to set us for a hearing on another day.

THE COURT: Let's do that then. My courtroom deputy will notify you, but I'm going to try to get to you this week.

MR. BAILEY: I understand.

THE COURT: We will try to set up a time period where we can hear oral argument. Let's go to SNAP.

MR. HENIFIN: So the issue here, as you are well

aware, we created a rate customer classification based on their receiving SNAP benefits. The idea was if we are going to be collecting and shutting water off from everybody in the city to get our collection rate back to where it needs to be, the water needs to be affordable for everyone. And there is a class of our customer base that is challenged economically, and they have already been recognized as a special class of customers by the U.S. Government and the State of Mississippi as SNAP beneficiaries. So they qualify for essentially food assistance and help with a nutrition program.

We wanted to build off of that and use that same classification to determine if they also should be eligible for water at a reduced rate that is commensurate with their income.

So at that, we created the SNAP customer classification. We recognize that to get the most customer participation, the best way for that to happen would be a connection to the SNAP rolls and automatically run that through our billing system to look for matches based on names and addresses that are both in the SNAP benefit rolls and that are customers of JXN Water, and those customers would be automatically enrolled in the customer classification for SNAP and receive the SNAP rate, which is approximately \$30 lower than a regular rate. And again, it works well with the economics based on the SNAP income levels that are published by the federal government.

So we think this is a great solution to provide affordable

water to folks that otherwise will be shutting off if they can't afford to pay their bill and go without water altogether. Shutoffs are a blunt instrument, but it is the only way to get folks paying their bills regularly. And the last thing we want to do is shut off someone who really can't afford their water. So we have built in some customer assistance programs and some other things, but the critical part of this is the SNAP benefit or the SNAP rate classification, and to automatically categorize folks into that was really the best solution all the way around.

We estimate 15,000 accounts are receiving SNAP benefits within the city of Jackson. If we don't do this categorically, where we automatically put them in based on SNAP data, we believe only a fraction of the folks will come forward to fill out forms or provide proof of their SNAP benefits to JXN Water. And that's played out across the country in similar programs, none of them are SNAP based, where if you put an added burden on the customer to prove they are eligible for something, immediately you see a significant drop in the number of people that actually file for or decide to get the benefit they have earned basically by the classification where they are at.

We expect to see a very low turnout for that and a very small number of people actually receiving the benefit of this customer classification that we have created. So we really, to be successful, we need the SNAP data to run it against our

customer database. We have approached the State on that and gotten the answer no. I would like my lawyer, Mr. Calamita, to discuss the restrictions that have been cited under the federal law and how we think we still qualify under those restrictions, if that is okay with you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That is okay with me.

MR. CALAMITA: Thank you, Your Honor. I will be very brief.

As Mr. Henifin indicated, in addition to trying to provide a significant reduction in monthly rates for the benefit of people who really can't afford it, who have already been identified by the federal government, if we don't do that, we are going to end up wasting a lot of JXN Water dollars chasing those people and collecting turn-offs/turn-on.

So when we think about a viable utility going forward, this is a key part of it, making sure that all of our rate payers have rates they can actually afford to pay. Otherwise, we waste more public dollars chasing bad debt. So that's a key part of it.

We filed a motion, Your Honor, asking the Court to order the State to give us the list of SNAP recipients, and the State -- there has been a response focusing largely on privacy concerns and burden. And in thinking about it and talking to counsel, my thought, Your Honor, is that we would file a revised motion to go kind of right to the heart of the matter

and ask you to order the federal government -- the State has come up with a number of horribles. I don't think I agree with any of them personally, Your Honor, but rather than spend a lot of time on that, we think a more direct route that takes all of the State concerns out is to ask the Court to order the federal government to quarterly give Mr. Henifin, an officer of the Court, the latest SNAP list, and then JXN Water will compare that to their single-family apartment or residential customers.

I think Mr. Henifin has been upfront when he adopted this rate pursuant to the special order, that people in multi-family housing or different facilities, we are not going to be able to reach them, but we think we can reach, you know, 80, 90 percent of the folks who are -- who would benefit from these rates if we get the list. If we don't get the list, Your Honor -- I have 300 utilities clients across the country. When the customer has to do something to get a benefit, typically we would see like a 30-percent participation rate. So if we have to do mailers or put stuff online, there's all sorts of reasons: People don't trust the government, they are embarrassed, they don't have time, they just don't understand.

So we really see this as a critical for those folks who are most vulnerable, who have suffered a long time, Your Honor, in this community, to give them -- for them to pay a fair rate and to reach as many of them as possible. It won't be perfect. We won't be able to reach them all because of confidentiality

concerns, like somebody who is in an apartment building and the landlord pays the rent. There we are going to have to have a separate system over time for them to authorize us to talk to their landlord about they get a reduced rent, if that's what they authorized.

But we think in the way we are asking for it, we can get most of those folks, subject to an order from the Court about how your agent -- your officer, Your Honor, provides the confidentiality around that list. I can't believe, as I stand here today, that the federal government, who came to your court for jurisdiction over this public health emergency, can't provide an officer of the Court with the SNAP list pursuant to whatever confidentiality provisions they would like to suggest to the Court, Your Honor. That is really all I have.

We would propose to amend our motion, ask the Court to do that. I don't know the position the federal government would take, but unless you have questions, Your Honor, that's all I have.

THE COURT: Just one to start off with. What empirical data do you have to say that people won't respond?

MR. CALAMITA: I can get it for you, Your Honor, but, for example, Kansas City, Missouri is a client. They have a general fund subsidy program. Thirty percent of the eligible people participate, after years, Your Honor, of trying to get people to do it. And that's what I hear with other folks.

My understanding is, the SNAP program here in Jackson, only 70 percent of the people who would get a check are getting a check. And this program has been around for a long time. Some people are too embarrassed to participate in these programs. Others don't take the time. They may be on drugs, Your Honor. I have no idea. It is disheartening that we can't get people in need to take advantage of these programs, but that's been my experience. I don't have specific numbers, but I can get you some if you want to see, Your Honor.

We are convinced, though, we have to do it where the State sends a mailer -- by the way, the State has worked with us to try to come up with some alternatives, but we know those alternatives will reach a far -- the penetration or the participation rate will be so low that it won't achieve the objective we are trying to do, which is fair rates for people particularly who have suffered for a long time, Your Honor, and avoiding the public utility cost of having to chase people who really can't pay and shouldn't have to pay a rate they can't pay for these basic human services, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. CALAMITA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Is there a representative from the federal government here?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, Your Honor. Can I indulge the Court for one minute for a quick side bar with Mr. Henifin?

THE COURT: Okay. 1 2 (Mr. Fingerhood confers with Mr. Henifin.) 3 MR. FINGERHOOD: Okay. Never mind. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Then on this matter of an order from this Court on SNAP to divulge the identities, any 5 6 problems? 7 MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, we do have a problem with that. 8 The problem is there is a law that protects the confidentiality 9 of this information. And we appreciate that the counsel for ITPM noticed this up and we had an opportunity to respond. 10 11 also filed a supplemental declaration. 12 I won't go through all of the arguments there, but, you 13 know, we acknowledge the good intentions of the SNAP rate plan, but there are statutes that protect the confidentiality. And I 14 15 think as explained in the declaration that we submitted 16 yesterday, releasing a blanket release of SNAP participants 17 could actually have an additional chilling effect on people 18 deciding to participate in the program. 19 As Mr. Calamita alluded to, you know, there's not a 20 hundred percent participation by people who are eligible for 21 the program. I think a blanket release of this information would be problematic. 22 More importantly, as far as his proposed order, in the 23 24 declaration at paragraph 10, USDA does not have this

It's the State that has the information.

USDA

25

information.

does require that the State maintain the confidentiality of the information and provides certain penalties and safeguards that the State has to comply with to ensure the confidentiality of the information. So the State, you know, has to keep this information confidential as well.

They alluded to a couple of exceptions to this statute, and as we explained in our brief, although Mr. Henifin is an officer of the Court, the exception applies to federal assistance programs, such as the National School Lunch Program, or Women, Infant and Children Program, also known as WIK. So that exception does not apply.

He references some cases that limited amounts of SNAP recipient information was related in the context of discovery. As we explain in those cases, here the SNAP recipients are not parties to this action and haven't consented to the release.

Now, while there are federal laws and state laws that protect the confidentiality, we did indicate that we are willing to do some sort of workaround where, you know, either the State would let the SNAP recipients know that they are eligible for this program, that is, essentially, instead of paying \$40 a month, they could pay ten dollars a month. So they would be informed of this. There would be some sort of return post card, you know, and we are, of course, willing to work out all of the mechanics and the details to ensure that whatever we would work out would comply with the law, but

basically, these people would agree that their information could be disclosed to Mr. Henifin for the purpose of receiving essentially a 75-percent reduction in their bill, which I think is a pretty large incentive.

And I know Mr. Calamita said there may be anecdotal evidence that it won't work. I think before we try and do something that could possibly violate federal and state laws, that it's worth at least a shot.

So as I said, one last thing, you know, it's -- it would be, in our opinion, burdensome for the state to provide this information on a quarterly basis. It's my understanding that this information is updated annually during a certification or recertification process. So that's an additional problem.

And I was trying to think of an analogy. I understand and acknowledge, as I said, the good intentions of this, but, you know, I've been going through this recently with a daughter who's attending college. I mean, colleges could reach more eligible students with financial aid if, for example, a state college could say, all right, State of Mississippi, give us all the names of all the students with income under this level. Sure, they could reach a lot more people, but there's laws that prevent that and also confidentiality concerns.

People would be more reluctant to -- you know, I filled out the FAFSA, and I said, I give you consent to get my tax information from the IRS, and we would propose something

similar here. Again, I think a blanket release of this information could have a chilling effect on the program, the SNAP program as a whole, put aside the participation from recipients in this water benefit. If people know that their information is going to be released without their consent, that could have a chilling effect on the SNAP program itself.

THE COURT: So then how would you help Mr. Henifin?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, as I suggested, I think the

State could send out, like, either -- either set up a website

or something and say, if you consent to us -- there's this

program out here. You can pay \$10 instead of \$40. If you

consent to participating in this program, go to this website,

enter this code, or it could be, you know, a pre-addressed

envelope that said, if you agree to us giving this information

to JXN Water, please sign this postage prepaid card and drop it

in the mail.

There are, I think, things that could be done along those lines that would be consistent with the state and federal laws, and also, you know, maybe we wouldn't get a hundred percent, but I think, as I said before, given a 75-percent discount, \$10 versus \$40 a month, I think it would be pretty successful and certainly worth trying.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Henifin, when you mail out your bill statements, couldn't you also mail out a letter concerning the SNAP benefits?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, we could. 1 2 THE COURT: And just tell them to sent it back in the 3 enclosed envelope? 4 MR. HENIFIN: We could do that. High administrative 5 costs, but we could do that. 6 **THE COURT:** Like how high? 7 MR. HENIFIN: Just mailing out to -- we can't 8 identify the customers -- we'd have to send it to all of our 9 customers, because we don't know the subset. So we are sending 60,000 pieces of mail out. Potentially 60,000 return, so we 10 11 would have to open, sort, hand to someone to go to the account, 12 change the account classification. It's a lot of work, manual 13 work that, again, is bypassed with a database that can just be run against our database. So you are talking a couple of hours 14 15 of a data specialist versus weeks worth of manual work to deal 16 with 60,000 pieces of mail. 17 THE COURT: So obviously you feel you could cut down 18 a lot of time just by getting a list. MR. HENIFIN: Absolutely, Your Honor. 19 20 **THE COURT:** And to acquire a list, are you then in 21 favor of filing a lawsuit with this Court to try to get that list? 22 23 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, I am. 24 THE COURT: Okay. And prior to filing that lawsuit, 25 do you expect to enter into any settlement negotiations on that

1 motion with the other side? 2 MR. HENIFIN: I would be happy to enter any 3 negotiations prior to filing it. 4 **THE COURT:** Who will be negotiating that matter? 5 MR. HENIFIN: That's a good question. I would 6 assume -- at this point, if the federal government really 7 doesn't have the data, then we are back to dealing with the 8 state, and we would be negotiating with the Mississippi 9 Department of Human Services and the State of Mississippi. 10 **THE COURT:** And if you have to go the motion route, 11 how long before you file your motion? 12 MR. HENIFIN: We could file it next week, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Let's do that, then, and see 14 where we are. 15 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Fingerhood. 17 MR. FINGERHOOD: If I may be heard. I think one -- I 18 think one suggestion that we had, rather than Mr. Henifin 19 sending it out to all of his customers, I think the State might 20 be willing to send it specifically to the SNAP beneficiaries. 21 There would be some small administrative cost there, but, you know, like I said, a post card or something that says, "We 22 23 consent to your release of this information." 24 I certainly think that is probably a better use of the 25 money than spending money -- more money on lawyers and

involving a judge's time on this.

THE COURT: But the State says it might be an invasion of privacy to identify these people.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, no, the State already knows. They don't want to give the information to JXN Water unless the recipients have consented to the release of the information. So the State -- I don't know if they send monthly communications or what, but the idea I had, and I haven't really talked this over with the State, the State is -- at least this part of the State is not a party to this lawsuit. So I think they are here on Zoom listening, but they haven't been served with anything. I think they -- I sent them a copy of the papers.

But the idea would be that the State, you know, would send this mailer that we would work with JXN Water in drafting, saying you could be paying ten dollars instead of forty dollars per month on your bill. If you would like to do that and you are okay with us providing your name and address to JXN Water, sign this card and send it back.

THE COURT: So you are saying the Court nor Mr.

Henifin will see the actual names of persons who are thought to be on SNAP in the Southern District of Mississippi?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. They will only get that information once a post card has been returned saying, yeah, sure, sign me up, I consent to you giving my name and address

to JXN Water.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Counsel or Mr.
Henifin, either one, what do you think about this suggestion?

MR. CALAMITA: A couple of quick things. First, when the federal government starts with "We don't have the list," Your Honor, it's their program, it's their money, they have delegated it to the State. They could get that list in 30 seconds, Your Honor, probably 15 seconds.

So it is disappointing. You usually start with your best argument, and to start with that one I don't think is productive. That's number one.

Number two, again, Mr. Henifin is a federal official in the role -- for purposes of this role, and as we've briefed and will brief again, the rules do allow release of this information for federally -- equivalent federal programs trying to focus on low income folk.

And while we were sitting here, I did quickly Google, Your Honor, forgive me, but the Department of Health and Human Services says that for 2018, the Low Income Energy Subsidy Program that is well-known, been around for years, lots of advertising, less than 30-percent participation nationwide.

So if we do it their way, by sending a notice, we are going to miss a lot of folks, Your Honor, who have suffered, who we're trying to help. I do believe that -- we are all worried about privacy. I don't see any reason why they can't

give quarterly, indefinitely, Mr. Henifin the list pursuant to confidentiality so that he can provide an automatic benefit to those folks with no privacy concern whatsoever. JXN Water pursuant to a Court's confidentiality order would hold those quarterly lists.

You know, we just think that, otherwise, it is going to be years, Your Honor, and we are not going to be successful in getting these people in, and we are going to have problems with collection. It is going to undermine the utility. I apologize, Your Honor, for making you make a tough call, but we don't think -- we think it warrants asking the federal government to provide us with that list. And if they have to oppose that, we certainly understand it, but we are not going to be successful any other way.

THE COURT: Okay. What you want me to do with this is ask them whether they are going to submit it?

MR. CALAMITA: No, we are going to submit it, Your Honor, unless you tell us not to, because Mr. Henifin works for you, but we are going to ask you for that order probably next week. And we will not ask the State for it. We are going to ask the federal government, because the State has raised a number of issues, like, they may lose the program. The federal government may take it back if they inappropriately release the list. So to avoid all of those issues, which I do not believe are valid, we will file an order asking you to order the United

States to provide you with that list, to provide Mr. Henifin, your agent, your officer, with that list quarterly, and we think it's the right thing to do. It's a necessary thing to do in this public health emergency, Your Honor, and to move this utility forward.

Everybody says they want a viable utility on the other side of that. That is an extraordinary request and will be an extraordinary accomplishment, and they are going to have to work with us occasionally on some very unique things.

The last thing I will say is, this isn't precedential,
Your Honor. There is no other utility I'm aware of in the
country that has a Court-appointed official with a SNAP rate
adopted. This is like a unicorn. It is not precedential. And
I believe the Court can impose appropriate confidentiality
requirements, which we have done it for far more significant
things than a SNAP list in the history of the federal
judiciary.

Thank you for hearing us on this, Your Honor. We are passionate about it, because we care and it's critical to us being able to move forward.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Just one thing, Your Honor, and I don't want to be facetious, but, you know, there are a lot of great things that JXN Water could do if there weren't laws on the books. I mean, theoretically, you could say, well, you

1 know, why don't we just have the IRS send all the tax 2 information, and then we can target rates based on income. 3 Well, there's laws against that. There's a law that prohibits 4 There's a declaration from USDA that indicates this 5 could potentially cause damage to the SNAP program itself. Put 6 aside, you know, this is an established program that has helped 7 hundreds of thousands of people in Mississippi, probably 8 millions throughout the country. And, number one, we say they 9 don't have this information. The State maintains the information. Number two, it could damage this valuable 10 11 program. 12 So I don't see the big deal about working out something 13 where they send out a post card. You know, and that's fully 14 consistent with the laws on the books. But if they want to 15 bring a lawsuit and fight this and take it to the Fifth 16 Circuit, that's a lot of money that could be used on fixing the 17 system. 18 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 19 MR. WILLIAMSON: Your Honor --20 THE COURT: Yes. 21 MR. WILLIAMSON: -- can I just be heard briefly on this, Your Honor? 22 **THE COURT:** Okay. 23 MR. WILLIAMSON: Terry Williamson, counsel for the 24 25 City of Jackson. We do support the SNAP benefit rate, but I

would like for the Court to bear in mind that whatever relief that you decide to grant, that there's not going to be an officer of the Court who is going to be running, you know, the City of Jackson Water System forever, you know. It's going to go back to some entity that's not going to have a federal officer. And however this works out, it needs to -- somebody else is going to have to, you know, carry this program forward in the future.

So just bear that in mind, because what I hear Mr.

Calamita's basis for providing this information is that, you know, Mr. Henifin is an officer of the Court, you know, this is kind of a quasi-federal program, and that won't be the case forever. Thank you.

THE COURT: Well, don't move yet. We have had that discussion. In fact, we had that discussion this morning. Mr. Henifin and I had that discussion, that at some point there will be some kind of determination somewhere on this about what form this will take, I guess was the question. But we are well aware that when this matter first surfaced, that the timetable was generally thought to be four years, wasn't it? But that's not been decided. So that has not been decided, but I'm just saying that we fully recognize that there could be a sunset on this at some point.

I can't stay here with you all forever. So I know you want me to go ahead and do that, but I really can't. And for

some strange reason, Mr. Henifin seems to prefer Virginia over Mississippi and he thinks at some point he might be going home, but he doesn't know when yet. But we understand that, so don't think we have overlooked any of these things here. We have tried our best to anticipate everything that could come up, that might come up, and to work with it. So we just haven't gotten there yet. We just have so many other things that are on our plates, and so we are just moving, but we do understand there are other issues down the road.

I think Mr. Henifin pointed to some of those things back when he was making his comments about where the system is right now and that we still have a number of things that need to be addressed. So that particular issue has not raised its head yet, but it probably will at some point. But we will see. But thank you for reminding us of it, though.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Henifin, am I correct that we do recognize that --

MR. HENIFIN: This isn't forever?

THE COURT: -- that all good things come to an end?

MR. HENIFIN: Absolutely, Your Honor. This marriage is going to end at some point. A happy divorce.

MR. CALAMITA: Can I just mention on that topic, Your Honor, we know it is going to end. Our strategy, Your Honor, if we can do it our way and automatically apply this rate to

these folks, when it ends and there is no longer a federal officer running a quasi-federal program, to quote Mr.
Williamson, we will then be able to send out that notice to everybody and saying, hey, if you have been enjoying the SNAP eligible and you want to continue enjoying that benefit, send the State this letter. We think we will get much better participation two or three years down the road than if we try to start the less than 30 percent that a number of these other programs, like energy assistance, home energy assistance.

So that's our strategy, Your Honor, we know it is going to end, but we are trying to reach as many as people as we can as quickly as we can, not only for their benefit, but for the viability of the rate structure for the system and the future financial stability of the utility. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Thank you.

I think the morning and the first part of the afternoon has been productive, and we still have one other matter that I told you that I will contact the parties most effective to make an argument.

Ms. ACLU? Yes, ma'am.

MS. RANEY-GRAY: Thank you, Your Honor. I think one of my co-counsel on Zoom had one point we wanted to make about SNAP, if you will permit that.

THE COURT: What is your one point you want to make?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	So we just wanted to make sure that the record reflected
2	that we provided proposed plaintiff intervenors provided
3	extensive feedback on the rate change because there wasn't any
4	public commentary period or opportunity for the community to
5	weigh in on these rate changes. So we went ahead and put
6	together some extensive feedback and sent that feedback on the
7	proposed rate changes and water affordability options and other
8	considerations under the SNAP program to Mr. Henifin and his
9	attorneys, as well as the City of Jackson. And to date, we
10	have not heard back or any response to that. But we would be
11	happy to send our feedback to the Court and to the EPA if that
12	will be helpful for your consideration as well.
13	THE COURT: Could you just go ahead and send it to
14	us, as you put it, for our consideration? Would you go ahead
15	and do that now?
16	MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, we would be happy to, Your
17	Honor.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Who prepared it, by the way?
19	MS. HERNANDEZ: That would be the attorneys for the
20	proposed plaintiff intervenors of People's Advocacy Institute
21	and the Mississippi Poor People's Campaign.
22	THE COURT: I'm not making any promises, but I do

want to look at it.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, sir.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else from anybody?

1 MR. BLACK: Your Honor, may I speak?

THE COURT: Who is this?

MR. BLACK: Patrick Black. I'm general counsel for the Mississippi Department of Human Services.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. BLACK: We had submitted a letter to the Court.

We are not a party to this action, and so we did not file a response. We were made aware of the situation via the DOJ. I will say that Mr. Henifin and myself have been in conversation related to the proposed SNAP rate for some time now. And MDHS's position has been clear and consistent that we cannot provide the data as requested due to federal law. However, we proposed alternative manners in which this can potentially be achieved, but all of the feedback from Mr. Henifin has been that it's not going to be successful because of government mistrust or low client turnout. However, I would point out that the SNAP program is a client-driven program. They come to MDHS seeking that benefit.

Additionally, government trust, I would be concerned and remiss not to say anything about government trust if MDHS turns over all of our private clients' information to another program. At what point are we any better then? We will undermine our own credibility.

I would also point out that Mr. Henifin's initial estimation of how many Jacksonians this would reach has been

greatly inflated. In his filing, he believes that that's 39,000. MDHS pulled a Hinds SNAP data, and it was only 20,000. Now, that includes all of Hinds County. So to narrow that down further to just those zip codes that are COJ-eligible would further shrink that number even more. So we have concerns about the reach. We have concerns about the privacy. Additionally, we have some concerns about the overly burdensome requirement that this program is seemingly wanting to shift to MDHS. Everything is MDHS could send a mailer. Well, any mailer would be an unallowable cost for this agency. We can't cover that. It would also require our staff who are paid via the U.S. Department of Agriculture's grant time. That's not an allowable expense. We have also pointed that out to them.

The USDA, under their own declaration, has said as much, that any sort of breach would be against our State plan, which could essentially jeopardize the entire state's program. So instead of affecting it potentially, sub to 20,000 Jacksonians, it could affect over 200,000 Mississippians, who are also just as important and also just as in need.

I also, like Mr. Williamson, had concerns about what happens when this quasi-federal program is no longer in service. I can't participate. I can't provide that data to them then. It also is kind of short-sighted in that it does not account for any SNAP participants who are rolling off or make them come on after the federal conservatorship is over.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. BLACK: So I think that MDSH is not unwilling to work with the City of Jackson. Unfortunately, the manner in which they are seeking is not legally viable and, quite frankly, not worth the risk of losing the entire state SNAP program. I do think we could work with them, but it is going to require some outreach on their part, which they seem totally unwilling to do, based on the idea that government trust and just client empathy is not available. But that can't be -- those can't overrule federal law and our own clients' privacy.

THE COURT: Do you have another suggestion?

MR. BLACK: Well, we had said that if they wanted to develop a -- there's been talk of the State developing a westbound site. Well, we don't have the ability to create a website. We are also a grant-funded organization, and so I have no means in which to establish a website for the City of Jackson's Water Service. Mailers, I can't do that without cost. But if the City of Jackson were to create some sort of mailer, if the City of Jackson wanted to create a way for them to self verify or opt in, they could then provide that information to MDHS, and we could provide a simple yes or no without breaching our client's confidentiality.

But the manner in which they are wanting to do it currently is -- it's overly broad and breaches all federal and state policies related to the administration of the SNAP data.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Additionally, the idea now that they would sue the federal government for this data, unfortunately, like counsel has stated, this is not the federal government's data. federal grants program that is administered by the State. So the funds come to the State, but it is our clients and our data. And it is our duty to protect those clients data. THE COURT: All right. Back to my last question. What's your solution? MR. BLACK: Again, I'm happy to work with the City to try to find a workaround, but I don't have one other than the ones I suggested, which they have rejected outright at this time. **THE COURT:** So you don't have a suggestion now? MR. BLACK: I mean, my suggestion would be that the City of Jackson do the outreach and get the opt-in waiver from their clients, and then we can provide them a yes or no. THE COURT: Well, okay. Should you formulate a possible project and a possible approach, would you be so kind as to drop me a line on it? MR. BLACK: Yes, sir. I will direct you to the letter that I think we copied you on in which we did give some alternative ways in which we could comply with federal privacy rights but also hopefully get them the clients' participation

THE COURT: What was that last part?

in their program that they would like.

1 MR. BLACK: Excuse me, sir? 2 THE COURT: That last part. You would like 3 to furnish something --4 MR. BLACK: We could furnish them a way -- we could 5 then provide them a simple yes or no as to whether that client 6 is actually a SNAP member. 7 THE COURT: All right. MR. BLACK: Without breaching the client's entire 8 9 privacy. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 11 MR. BLACK: Thank you. 12 **THE COURT:** Does anybody have anything else on this? 13 All right. Thank you all so much. And for those on the 14 last matter, then we will contact you and let you know what our schedule looks like, and you can tell us whether you can meet 15 16 that schedule. If not, we will try to work with your schedule. 17 Thank you very much. 18 (HEARING CONCLUDED) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

3 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, Teri B. Norton, RMR, FCRR, RDR, Official Court
Reporter for the United States District Court for the Southern
District of Mississippi, appointed pursuant to the provisions
of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify
that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings
reported by me using the stenotype reporting method in
conjunction with computer-aided transcription, and that same is
a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and
understanding.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

__

S/ Teri B. Norton

TERI B. NORTON, RMR, FCRR, RDR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER